BAP
M4734
COPY 1

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No.

SCB

10167

Samuel Agnew
N. W. Cor. 11th & Filbert Sts.

The true Scripture Doctrine,

of the Mode and Subjects of Chriſtian

BAPTISM;

With ſome Strictures on Dr. GILL's Sentiments of the Moral Law, and Juſtification from Eternity.

IN SIX LETTERS

TO A

CANDID ANTIPÆDOBAPTIST.

BEING

A full Anſwer to DR. GILL's Sermon, at Mrs. Carmichael's dipping, and to all that he ever publiſhed on Baptiſm.

By HENRY MAYO, M. A.

The Law is holy, and the Commandment holy, juſt and good.

My Yoke is eaſy, and my Burden light.

Baptiſm——not the putting away of the Filth of the Fleſh.

Take heed that ye deſpiſe not one of theſe little ones: For I ſay unto you, that in Heaven, their Angels do always behold the Face of my Father.

LONDON:

Printed for JAMES BUCKLAND, at the Buck, J. JOHNSON and B. DAVENPORT, at the Globe, in Pater-Noſter-Row. MDCCLXVI.

Advertiſement.

THE writer of the following letters, hath no prejudice againſt any Antipædobaptiſt whatever; the candid among them he highly eſteems; he is honored with the friendſhip of ſeveral, and hopes he ever ſhall: His controverſy is neither with great or ſmall, ſave Dr. Gill; and nothing but his ſupra bigotry could have forced him to appear in print. Though the Doctor declares "ſcarce any thing new that is ſerious and pertinent can be expected from him," yet he muſt preach, and print, and reprint on the ſubject, and continue to inflame Chriſtians one againſt another; and as if all his own brethren were likewiſe ignorant of the Scriptures, and unlearned, he hath in the preface to his late ſermon, declared his determination to write againſt every advocate for infant Baptiſm: Thus, he hath certainly conſtituted himſelf, the Champion for the kingdom of adult dipping; but how fit a perſon he is for that high office, the following letters will ſhow. Their author acknowledges himſelf indebted to Meſſrs. Towgood's and Fleming's excellent and unanſwerable tracts on the ſubject: If he hath brought the controverſy into a leſs compaſs, and reflected a little more light on any part of it, 'tis all the merit he claims. He hopes the letters will be of ſervice, to promote obedience to the law of God; and charity, love and mutual forbearance, among thoſe that differ in an external rite; and to eſtabliſh them that are wavering through the cunning

cunning craftineſs of a few Bigots, who would compaſs ſea and land to make one proſelyte to dipping, and glory more in him, than in ninety and nine proſelytes to righteouſneſs and holineſs; who being partakers of Chriſt's Baptiſm in their infancy, need no more water Baptiſms, much leſs Dr. Gill's.

If this is the fruit (to borrow the Doctor's words) I am content to bear the indignities of men; and ſhall reckon it an overbalance to all his reproaches and inſults. Whatever hard names are found in the letters, are the Doctor's own; which might have been returned to him, with much greater propriety, than he beſtowed them on

CANDIDUS.

CONTENTS.

LETTER I.

Page 1

Shews the occasion of the correspondence and publication.

LETTER II.

Proves that the moral Law, and the Commandments of Christ, are not grievous. 5

LETTER III.

Proves that dipping is a grievous command. 15

LETTER IV.

Proves that Christian Baptism, is lawfully administered by sprinkling. 20

LETTER V.

Proves that Infants are lawful Members of Christ's Church. 37

LETTER VI.

Recapitulates the chief Arguments against Dr. Gill, and concludes with wholesome Advice to him. 64

CONTENTS.

SIX LETTERS

TO A

Candid ANTIPAEDOBAPTIST.

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY APR 1881 LIBRARY PROPERTY OF

LETTER I.

Shews the occaſion of the correſpondence and publication.

SIR,

AT a late interview, *Baptiſm* was the chief topic of converſation; the occaſion you well know, a third perſon mentioned the name of Carmichael, and ſpoke of him as a miniſter of the Kirk of Scotland, converted to your denomination *. Being perſuaded from our frequent converſations upon the eſſentials of religion, we could freely converſe about an external rite, without falling out, or thinking the worſe of each other; Baptiſm employed our remaining time. Our conference ended, with a reſolution to meet at the place where this remarkable convert was to be rebaptized (or baptized which you pleaſe.) As a perſon diſtinguiſhed with the honourable appellation of D. D. was to officiate; you remember our expectations were very high, as to being entertained and profited. We met, but I know you was as greatly diſappointed, ſurprized, and vexed as myſelf;

* Dr. Gill alſo (for very obvious reaſons) hath ſtiled him miniſter of the goſpel in Edinburgh; but to whom did he miniſter? And, was his miniſtry valid before dipped or not? Know all men that it is unqueſtionably true, this reverend Proſelyte was never a miniſter of the Kirk of Scotland, in Edinburgh, or any other place: He was only a private member of that church, and a very unſtable one; for after a time he fell off to the Seceders; then he revolted from them to the pure Glaſſites, and now being caſt out by them, he hath joined himſelf to the charitable Antipædobaptiſt Dr. Gill: With whom may he reſt!

from his prayer, we concluded *(as did many beſides)* we had come in vain, not being able to hear half he uttered; I really thought, through age or infirmities his voice was impaired, that made him ſo low; becauſe, in ſo ſolemn an act of worſhip as *prayer*, when a miniſter is profeſſedly the mouth of the people; doubtleſs, if able, he ought to ſpeak ſo as to be heard, elſe how can fellow worſhippers join with him, how can they ſay *Amen?* But, Sir, how ſoon after mentioning his text, did he convince us, he had a maſculine ſtrong voice? In pronouncing *certain words*, you obſerved the fire burned within him, his eyes flamed, and the whole houſe was filled with his voice; it ſounded like a ruſhing wind, and (to uſe his own words) we were all as if immerſed into and covered with it, *ergo*, I was then baptized if never before. You will forgive me this, becauſe yourſelf was a little warm at the Doctor's ſermon; and indeed it was impoſſible, for any perſon of the utmoſt moderation and charity, but to be ſomewhat diſguſted.

You were a witneſs, Sir, how he railed at thoſe who differed from him: You remember, he repreſented the greater part of the Chriſtian world * as *unbaptized Heathens*; and their miniſters, as either *unlearned*, or *ignorant of the ſcriptures*, or both; in brief, he made them either *fools*, or *deceivers*; as you heard the ſermon, you know this to be no miſrepreſentation of him, or his diſcourſe; rather the groſſeſt miſrepreſentation of the ſermon preached by Dr. Gill, is that which is now publiſhed with his name prefixed.

The head hangs by a ſtring tumbled and toſt,
Some limbs torn off, are laid aſide and loſt,
The body what is left of it rent and tore,
Pieces ſtuck on that ne'er were his before,
But o'er the mangl'd heap, the author ſtands
Proclaims the work the glory of his hands.
Oh pity him, Chriſtian friends!

* Doubtleſs there are two thouſand Pædobaptiſts to one Antipædobaptiſt.

The

The printed ſermon to be ſure is *Catholic*, compared with what he delivered; the polite words, *abſurd*, *abſurdity*, &c. you ſee are not ſo frequently repeated in print; as alſo a gentle turn is given to ſeveral paſſages; he confeſſes indeed, that what he hath publiſhed is no nearer what he preached, than *his memory* could aſſiſt him; and it pleaſes me, his memory is not quite ſo *uncharitable* as his lips.

Knowing the Doctor's great fondneſs to appear in print, hardly an occaſional ſermon he preaches, but what is "*publiſhed at, or by requeſt*;" I thought to give him a gentle admonition or two firſt in a public paper, that we might have as maſterly a defence of adult dipping as poſſible: You ſee, Sir, what good effects it produced; *angry ſnarls* from ſome of his warm brethren, and a volley of *hard names* from himſelf, in the preface and notes to his elaborate work. If his works live to immortality, I ſhall live alſo; and if *Chriſtians* will believe him, ſhall be conſidered as a *wiſe-acre*, an *ignorant*, *impertinent*, *illiberal*, *canting*, *cowardly*, *cavilling*, *calumniating*, *ſcoffing*, *ſcurrilous*, *vilifying ſcribbler*, *a lying worthleſs writer*. I hear you ſay, he has let himſelf low enough indeed; ſtrange, Sir, my gentle touch ſhould make him wince ſo; but do not ſmile at it, for I really fear what will be the conſequences, both as to himſelf, and with reſpect to others. Hath he not loſt the poſſeſſion of himſelf? certainly he hath given the enemy too great an advantage over him, and over the common cauſe: If *Proteſtants* can thus treat their brethren, and give way *to malice*, and *envies*, and *evil ſpeakings*, no wonder if the infallible *Church of Rome*, to fiery words add ſtakes, to convince us theirs is the right way, and the true church; and compel us to come in.

His *rude attack* upon me, you know, Sir, excited nothing but pity for him in my breaſt; and when I ſaw how my kind intentions were perverted, and beheld the *bitter fruits* in his writing and behavior, it almoſt repented me, I had ſtrove with him. However, to bring him (if poſſible) to the proper exerciſe of his reaſon; to convince him he is fallible as well as other mortals; and to en-

gage him *in futuro*, to diſplay more humility, juſtice and charity, I have complied with your and other friends deſire, to offer my thoughts this way; hoping with you, that a few candid ſtrictures on the Doctor's ſermon, will be ſerviceable to abate his and a few others *watry*, as well as *fiery zeal*, and make them ſpeak and behave towards others, more like Chriſtians: Your requeſt of prefixing my name is alſo granted, which (as the Doctor knew by a letter) might have been diſpenſed with; but as you hint, it will prevent his having any more recourſe, to that ſtale obſervation of the Indians way of fighting. My next ſhall bring to remembrance the Doctor's *judicious explanation* of his text: In the mean time I am,

Yours, &c.

LETTER II.

Proves that the moral Law, and the Commandments of Chriſt, are not grievous.

SIR,

THE Doctor's text you remember was 1 John v. 3. *For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments, and his commandments are not grievous.* By the commands, he told us, "the Apoſtle did not mean the "Ten Commandments ſtiled the moral *law*; *no*, the mo- "ral precepts were grievous, a fiery law, the miniſtra- "tion of condemnation and death; and as they were "not eaſy of obſervation, ſo they were not binding on "Chriſt's diſciples; therefore Baptiſm and the Lord's "Supper muſt be here underſtood by the command- "ments, which Chriſtians were to keep, and which were "not grievous." I can ſafely appeal to you, whether theſe were not his expreſſions *verbatim*, (if a word or two be omitted or added, it is on the candid ſide) which gave us great concern; and you remember made me ſay, *his expoſition of the text was doubtleſs ad rem:* You thought this was too gentle a rebuke; and wondered I had not been more faithful, and more ſevere upon him; for his *ſevere treatment* of the law of God; for repreſenting *that* in ſo unfavourable a light, which recommends itſelf in every precept to all men; which is the voice of nature, and of reaſon, as well as of revelation: Indeed, Sir, I judge with you, that there is not a moral precept in the Bible, but reaſon at once approves of, and which every man's conſcience tells him it is his indiſpenſible duty to eſteem and obey. What hath God required of man, but to *do juſtly*, *to love mercy*, and to *walk humbly with his God*; are, theſe things to be *complained of*, and eſteemed *hardſhips*, by creatures who are upheld every moment in life, by the unwearied goodneſs of their great law-giver; much leſs by thoſe who were redeemed by the blood of his own Son? It would be no hard taſk, to prove the moral law, what the Apoſtle ſtiles it, *holy*, *juſt* and *good**; whatever

* Romans vii. 12.

it

it requires us to do, or commands us to abſtain from, as it is highly reaſonable, ſo abſolutely neceſſary for our well-being here, and our eternal happineſs: Surely, its precepts tend to promote the welfare of body and mind, of individuals, families and ſtates; yea to adorn, exalt, and perfect human nature: and ſhall we ſay then, that they are *grievous?* doth not that man who ſtiles them ſo, *traduce* the law of God, and God himſelf; doth not he hold him up to public view, as an *arbitrary tyrant*, as an *Egyptian taſk maſter*, as giving precepts that were not good in themſelves, and alſo rigorous and cruel. How contrary this, to God's own proclamation of himſelf, *the Lord, the Lord God merciful and gracious, long ſuffering, and abundant in goodneſs and truth, keeping mercy for thouſands* *; could any thing proceed from him then, that was unrighteous, and unmerciful towards his creatures? I hear you reply, *the ſtatutes of the Lord are right*, and all his *moral commandments*, are *pure* and *equitable*; ſuited to our natures, and calculated for our felicity; and inſtead of being called *a fiery law*, ſhould be the rejoicing of our hearts: Your language is, that every one who knows what the *love of God* to ſinners hath been, and ſtill is, and is really poſſeſſed of *love to God*; will never ſay, his moral commandments are grievous. What though the fleſh is weak, what if human nature be degenerate and fallen, what if the heart is deceitful, what if the affections be ſtrongly biaſſed to earthly things, what if there be many temptations from without, as well as hurtful luſts within; are not the *promiſes of God* in his word, the *gracious aids* of his ſpirit, and the *ſupplies of grace and ſtrength* that are *in Chriſt*, more than ſufficient to counterbalance? How many humble and ſincere Chriſtians have been able to ſay, *through Chriſt ſtrengthening us, we can do all things* †. They have gone on with pleaſure, from one command and duty to another; from one degree of ſtrength and obedience to another; till, like the *author and finiſher of their faith*, they have finiſhed the work God gave them to do, and came off *more than conquerors*.

In brief, Sir, who that conſiders the *law-giver*, a God of infinite wiſdom, goodneſs and compaſſion, can dare

* Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7. † Phil. iv. 13.

to

to say, *his statutes are grievous*; who that considers how holy, just and good they are, how reasonable, how well calculated, how *absolutely necessary* to our well being in time and for eternity; who that considers the powerful and divine aids he grants to them, that call upon him with a pure heart; who that looks upward, to the *everlasting hills*, and takes a view of the glorious rewards, riches and honours, he will bestow on the faithful and obedient servant, after his short work and warfare here is accomplished; who that attends to *these things*, can suffer a thought to arise within him, that the *moral precepts of God are grievous?*

You observed, Sir, that the Doctor's character of the moral law, was not only an *unjust*, and *injurious one*, and by it he reflected on the great legislator and his perfections; but that he represented it, as having no *commanding power* over Christians. This is not to be wondered at; he that can think lightly, and speak severely of it, cannot want much temptation to set it aside, and argue against it in print; if we may judge from *Dr. Gill's writings*, and believe *Fame's trumpet*, some of the moral commandments are certainly grievous to him; as, *humility*, *charity*, *love the brotherhood*, *follow peace with all men*, *bless and curse not*, *mourning for sin*, *mortifying passion*, &c. These are distasteful, *ill-favoured commandments*, which many nominal Christians will not meddle with; "and "why should we, say they? Christ hath obeyed the whole "law and fulfilled all righteousness for us, he is our sanc- "tification, and it is detracting from his merits, suffi- "ciency and grace, to think of a frail man's personal "obedience, and righteousness."

But, Sir, did the gospel of Christ abolish, or set aside the moral law? Or did his obedience and death, lessen men's obligation to observe it, as the rule of heart and life? *No:* under the gospel, obedience is not the *condition* of obtaining eternal life, but it is *the way*, the true and *only safe way*, in which we must walk to inherit it; this is the language of scripture, *do we make void the law, through faith? God forbid, yea we (Apostles of Christ) establish*

eſtabliſh the law *. *Without holineſs, no man ſhall ſee the Lord* †.

But hath Dr. *Gill* ſet aſide, or made void the law? Not ſo much in his printed, as in his *extempore ſermon*; you obſerve what *guards* he hath now placed on ſome of his expreſſions, and given others a *gentle touch* as with a crow quill. But ſtill, how *exceptionable*, and *inconſiſtent!* Take a proof or two of his ſound mind.

He ſays "That the moral law delivered by Moſes is "to be obſerved by Chriſtians;" *but how?* "to be kept "from a principle of love to God ‡." I grant this to be the nobleſt motive, the moſt conſtraining principle that can animate the Chriſtian's breaſt; but is it not, Sir, to be kept *from duty*, as well as *love?* Doubtleſs; tho' I fear the Doctor (like too many others) thinks that Chriſt came into the World, to ſet men free from the obligation, or commanding influence of the law of God; *elſe* why had he not mention'd *duty*, as well as love; and why did he exalt *external rites*, and *poſitive inſtitutions* above moral precepts, "among the commandments of Chriſt "(ſays he) Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper are the chief "and principal ||;" and why did he entirely omit *moral precepts*, and mention only *Baptiſm* and the *Lord's Supper*, as not grievous, when he was expreſsly exhorting his auditory, to obſerve the commandments of God and of Chriſt §. But are Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper, the chief and principal commands? *Far from it*, they are rather *the leaſt*; though conſcientiouſly to be obſerved by Chriſtians; yet are they greatly inferior to, and not to be compar'd with the *weighty things* of the moral law. Knows he not, that God requires the heart, and obedience to his moral law, rather than ſacrifice, or the obſervance of any external rites whatever? You do, Sir, (if he doth not) and have often lamented, that ſo many miſtake the nature and end of moral and ritual precepts; and that ſo many *antipaedobaptiſts* in particular, lay ſuch ſtreſs upon being dipped into the water; as to think that

* Rom. iii. 31. † Heb. xii. 14. ‡ Sermon, pag. 5.
|| Ib. pag. 7. § Ib. pag. 29.

without

without it, men cannot be true Disciples of Christ, nor members of his visible church here, and entertain but little hopes of their entering the kingdom of glory.

If the Doctor will turn to *Matt.* v. ver. 17, 18, 19. and *see with his eyes, and understand with his heart*; he will clearly discover the vast importance of moral precepts and *men's obligation* to observe them. The Son of God came to set mankind free from the tyranny of Satan, from the bondage of corruption, from the guilt of sin, from Pagan superstitions, and from Jewish ceremonies; this is the freedom with which the Son of God invests his Disciples; *glorious freedom!* Happy they who by the Son are thus made free: But that he came *to abolish* the moral law, or to free his Disciples from obedience to any of its precepts; as 'twas indeed what his enemies laid to his charge, so was it without any foundation; which he prov'd from its stability and permanency; *heaven and earth shall pass away*, the frame of the universe shall be dissolved, *sooner than one jot*, the least part of *this divine law shall pass*, or lose its commanding power over the consciences and lives of men: That none of his Disciples might think, that his own perfect obedience did cancel, or render theirs less necessary; you see, Sir, he represents the moral precepts, as continuing in full force, *to be fulfill'd by them*, to the consummation of all things: Hence he added that *whosoever should break*, wilfully neglect, and habitually violate the divine commands, any, yea *but one*, and that the *very least of them*, and *teach others so to do*, either by preaching, conversation or example, *should be called*, considered and treated, *as the least*, the unworthiest and most contemptible of all *his Disciples*, or members of his visible church. What greater zeal for the law of God, could the Savior manifest, than is contained in those words; what sentence could he utter, of more force to oblige his followers to *prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God* * concerning them, and to be found in universal obedience to it? Surely the Christian is not *to pick and chuse* among the commandments; but to pay a conscientious, and I was going to say, an *equal respect* to all, (for the least

* Romans, xii. 2.

hath the ſame ſtamp of authority on it as the greateſt; he is to eſteem none of them, *little* or *inconſiderable*, much leſs *burdenſome*, and *grievous*; and I will be bold to ſay, that the *preacher* who deſignedly leads men to think, they are releaſed from their obedience and duty to the moral law; and who doth not from time to time, inculcate upon his hearers, the moral precepts of God and Chriſt, as well as preach Jeſus and the reſurrection, the virtues of his death and exaltation; is no *real friend* of Chriſt, nor of the ſouls of men; and no wonder his preaching is as vain, as *ſounding braſs*, and a *tinkling cymbal*.

But now, Sir, let us turn from the *exceptionable* part of the Doctor's expoſition of his text, to the *inconſiſtent*. The very firſt ſentence of his printed ſermon is "What "I ſhall ſay in the following diſcourſe will much depend "on the ſenſe of the word Commandments, by which "are meant not the ten commandments, or the com-"mands of the moral law." Now, as the diſcourſe was entirely on *water Baptiſm*, to be ſure, that was the *proper ſenſe* of the word, as well as the *chief command*; but by my help (which, inſtead of gratefully acknowledging, he abuſes me for, ſtiling it a ſneer) he hath found, that the commands in his text, were not *ſimply*, nor *chiefly*, Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper; for he hath now added "rather "the commandments of faith and love, the Apoſtle ſpeaks "of in the 3d chap. 23d ver. may be deſign'd *." But why refer us ſo far back? Is it not ſaid chap. iv. 21. *And this commandment have we from him, that he who loveth God, love his brother alſo*; and doth not the Apoſtle continue his diſcourſe on thoſe two great commands, even to the text? Now pray, Sir, what difference is there between the moral law, and love to God and our neighbor? I always took them to be one and the ſame thing; and ſo did the learned Doctor himſelf once, if it is lawful to quote againſt him his own words, or ſet *John* againſt *Gill*; "The moral law was given by Moſes, the ſum of "which law is love to God, and love to our neighbor, "as appears from that anſwer which Chriſt gave to the "Lawyer, who put this queſtion to him, ſaying, *Maſ-"ter, which is the great commandment in the law? Jeſus ſaid*

* pag. 7.

"*unto*

" *unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy* " *heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind; this* " *is the first and great commandment; and the second is like* " *unto it, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself: On these* " *two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.* Hence " it is that the Apostle Paul says, that *love is the fulfilling* " *of the law* *." You see, *here* he says the sum of the moral law, is *love* to God, and our neighbor; and this love is the fulfilling of the law; and in his late discourse, he acknowledges, that the commandments of faith and love, are chiefly intended in the text, *which were commands of Christ, and were not grievous* †, and yet, Sir, the moral law is not meant. So that he hath written *these contradictions*, as with a *sun beam*; the moral law is *not meant* by the commands in his text, yet that which is the sum of it, is *chiefly design'd:* The moral law *is grievous, a fiery law, the letter that kills, the ministration of condemnation and death*; but love to God and love to our neighbor, on which hang all the law and the prophets, are not grievous; can you tell, Sir, why one should deserve such hard epithets, and not *the other*, which are just the self-same thing: Or how came it to pass that as the subject of his discourse so much depended on the *sense* of the word Commandments, which are now by him confessedly, love to God and our neighbor; *water Baptism* should be the alone burden of his song. *Highly proper and pertinent!*

You may wonder that a man should be so inconsistent with himself; not merely *in preaching*, but even *in print*, contradicting in one page, what he hath asserted in another; and still more wonder, that a minister should speak so lightly, if not detractingly of that great law, by which his preaching and his works, and by which we all shall be judged in the last day; but my admiration is not at all rais'd; I verily think him capable of much *greater absurdities*; not barely from the sermon we heard him preach, but from another pamphlet of his, now before me, *on the doctrine of justification:* Wherein he asserts; not only that the law hath no commanding and con-

* Smith's funeral sermon, pag. 9. † pag. 7.

 demning

demning power over the believer in Chriſt, but "That the "goſpel is all promiſes, it hath no commands, nothing "in it looks like a law *; that the reaſon why we are "juſtified, is not becauſe we have faith; but the reaſon "why we have faith, is becauſe we are juſtified †; "that all the elect of God are juſtify'd and pardon'd "whilſt they are ungodly;" and that no perſon might miſtake him, he hath defin'd an *ungodly perſon*; "he is "one without the grace and fear of God, and without "Chriſt, being deſtitute of a true knowledge of him, "of faith in him and love to him, ſuch a perſon being "thus ungodly, 'tis evident God juſtifies and pardons ‡." *Nay, Sir*, don't be ſurpriz'd yet, for he goes much farther, he aſſerts that theſe ungodly perſons "are and "muſt be acquitted, diſcharged and juſtified from eter- "nity, ſo as nothing could be laid to their charge ‖:" In conſequence of this, "none of the elect's ſins are ac- "counted to them, but 'tis the will of God, plain and "manifeſt to puniſh ſin not in them, but in his Son §;" and thus, *he aſſerts*, "they were eternally diſcharged, "acquitted from ſin, freed from puniſhment, and ſecured "from everlaſting wrath and deſtruction" **. So that, Sir, you ſee, men are actually juſtify'd and pardon'd, while alienated from the life of God, and enemies to him by wicked works, and in a ſtate of guilt and condemnation; yea they are *actually pardon'd*, before they commit any ſin, and even before *they exiſt*. Is this the language of a D. D. or even of a rational creature ††? You aſk me where he found thoſe noſtrums; why he ſays

* pag. 13. Surely then Chriſtians may live as they liſt, for where there is no law there is no tranſgreſſion; but how contrary this to Titus ii. 11, 12. and iii. 8. et paſſim. Nay how contrary to himſelf in his baptiſmal Sermon, where he ſpeaks of *commands of Chriſt*.

† pag. 36. ‡ pag. 40, 41. ‖ pag. 48, 49.
§ pag. 54, 55. ** pag. 56.

†† Some, if not Dr. Gill, have a peculiar talent of making authors and their opponents ſay what they never thought of; and affirm, what they flatly deny; this I abhor, and therefore have taken the Doctor's own words, which are too plain and preciſe, to admit of any plauſible, or even probable miſrepreſentation.

our

our *found proteſtant divines* teach them; but the great queſtion is, *do reaſon, and revelation teach them?* reaſon pronounces them *abſurd*, and ſurely, Scripture declares them *heretical:* Can we be the objects of wrath, and of love; the children of God, and of the Devil, at one and the ſame time; can we be juſtify'd and pardon'd, (for the Doctor ſays all who are juſtify'd are pardon'd*) and yet at the ſame inſtant, be in a ſtate of condemnation; as the ſacred oracles declare every unbeliever is †: If the *intention*, or eternal purpoſe of God to juſtify men, (which is the Doctor's foundation ſtone) actually juſtifies them; they are as certainly, and actually, *called*, *ſanctify'd*, and *glorify'd* from eternity; ſo Chriſt was actually made a curſe before he was *born*, and even from *eternity*; and indeed the world and its inhabitants, were and muſt be created from eternity. How would an *American Savage* ſtare, and laugh to hear a Chriſtian divine, and a Doctor too, preach ſuch things; and ſo confidently aſſert, *that an intention or purpoſe concerning a thing, makes that thing actually to exiſt?* but there are many of his poor brethren, you well know, are ſadly convinced of the contrary; they find *words*, be ye warmed, be ye filled, and even *promiſes* to help them, are not *actions* that profit them, *much leſs* his intentions.

I purpoſed to do an act of Chriſtian kindneſs to the Doctor, in reproving him, according to the ſcripture exhortation ‡; but he was not *actually reprov'd*, till my letter was penn'd, and he read it: *Writing*, was the way in which he was actually reproved; and ſo *faith*, is the way the word of God declares, in which ſinners are actually juſtify'd. That they are not juſtify'd and pardon'd *before* faith, or *without* faith, and from eternity; but *by and through faith* ‖, which is the gift of God to them, in *this life*, there are *ſcriptures innumerable*, which demonſtrate: It would be inſulting your underſtanding to mention them; and as they are ſo plain, that humble ſincere Chriſtians cannot miſunderſtand them, ſo none but the *unlearned* and *unſtable*, do wreſt and pervert them.

* pag. 4. † John iii. 18. ‡ Lev. xix. 17.
2 Tim. iv. 2. ‖ Romans, iii. 30.

The concluſion of the whole matter is this; you ſee the Doctor ſadly miſtook his text, and what is worſe, took occaſion from it, to make void the moral law of God; repreſenting it as *grievous*, giving it hard names, and exalting poſitive inſtitutions above it: But what other could be expected *from one*, who in another publication, makes void even Faith itſelf? For if men are actually juſtify'd, and pardon'd, and freed from puniſhment, *from eternity*; what occaſion, Sir, for faith and repentance, or prayer for forgiveneſs of ſin; yea what need of *Baptiſm itſelf*, or the Lord's Supper; how needleſs was Chriſt's coming into the world; what neceſſity for him to ſend forth Apoſtles to preach the goſpel, that men's faith might come by hearing it; and what occaſion is there now, for him to ſend his Spirit with his word, to convince men of ſin, of righteouſneſs and of judgment, and to help them through faith, and the uſe of means, to perſevere unto ſalvation? What need for men to fear ſin, or to abſtain from it; if all future ſins are actually forgiven, as well as the paſt; if all are accounted to Chriſt, and puniſhed in him, and *never will be in them*. Truly, Sir, this notion of *eternal juſtification*, may well be ſtiled *eternal nonſenſe*; and as 'tis big with abſurdities, ſo *(tanquam equus Trojanus)* big with evils, to pure and undefiled religion, and to the morals and ſouls of men. The importance of the contents, will I hope excuſe the length of this epiſtle; wiſhing you every bleſſing I reſt,

Yours, &c.

LETTER III.

Proves that dipping is a grievous command.

SIR,

YOUR approbation of my laſt letter, (ſaying, it fully prov'd, the Doctor ſadly blundered in the explanation of his text, that he ſeem'd to be no great, nor real friend to the moral law, and was very inconſiſtent, in what little he ſaid reſpecting the commandments;) excites me to lay before you another proof, that *his text* had no reference to his *preachment*, but is entirely ſubverſive of it: Poſſibly you may differ from me in this, but I am perſuaded my ſpeaking with freedom, *(acting as a Proteſtant)* will not break the league of Chriſtian friendſhip, ſubſiſting, and which, *I hope*, will ever ſubſiſt between us.

The very next day after the Doctor's declamation, on *God's commands are not grievous*, you know one of your brethren, preached on a like occaſion from theſe words, "*From the beginning it was not ſo* *." Yourſelf wonder'd at the choice of ſuch a text, to recommend *Chriſtian Baptiſm*, and to prove, that 'tis only, *by dipping*; but as the choice of ſuch texts, to me, proves your brethren's ſad embarraſſment; ſo, was I like minded with you, I ſhould really ſuſpect that the preachers were *Pædobaptiſts incog*, or *in heart*; for never could more ſuitable words be choſen or applied, to overthrow all that the Doctor, and a few others, ſo rigidly and uncharitably contend for. If *Chriſtian Baptiſm* is to be perform'd after Dr. *Gill's mode*; 'twill be no hard taſk to prove, 'tis a command *more grievous* than *circumciſion*, or any jewiſh rite whatever. More grievous, Sir, both to the *baptizers*, and the *baptized*, which is ſelf evident; if 'tis neceſſary to go to the middle in water, and plunge the ſubject, however *tall*, and *corpulent*, quite under it, and the colder the weather, you know, Sir, the greater evidence of the perſon's love to God in ſubmitting to it; ſurely *'tis neceſſary*, not only that Chriſtians and churches ſhould be careful in the

* Matt. xix. 8.

choice

choice of their miniſters; that they be *able bodied men*, (have brawny arms and Herculean ſtrength) to dip in a maſterly way *at once**, without hazarding the ſubjects lives; but there is a needs be that the Baptizers be of Iron conſtitutions, if the cuſtom of dipping was general in cold climates: Which is a *qualification* for a ſcripture Biſhop or Paſtor, that Chriſt and his Apoſtles have intirely omitted; *perhaps through ignorance or inattention*. That dipping in cold countries, muſt needs be a *grievous command*, both to Miniſters and people, if they are of weak and infirm conſtitutions, you acknowledge; as it *endangers health*, and even *Life*; and indeed 'tis greatly to be feared, from ſome, if not *many inſtances*; that the thread of human life hath been cut aſunder much the ſooner reſpecting ſeveral, thro' ſubmitting to this *hazardous operation*. Let the ſubjects of Baptiſm be either men or women, as their being overwhelmed in water, muſt be very diſagreeable to them in cold weather, *tho' cloathed*; ſo if the practice of ſome in the third Century prevailed, *dipping naked*; bear with me, Sir, if I add, how inſufferably *indecent*, how impudently *immodeſt*; as well as *hazardous*, and *dangerous*? Beſides, if the ſubjects be *women*, how grievous would this rite be to the Miniſter; not *merely* endangering his health, by ſo frequent deſcending into the water in all weathers, (if the practice was univerſal) not only would he be in danger, of breaking the *ſixth Command*, by being acceſſary to, and even haſtening the death of the Baptized; but of violating the *ſeventh* alſo; for I ſuppoſe the Doctor and others of his brethren, tho' *Miniſters*; have much the ſame feelings, infirmities and paſſions, as others of Adam's fallen race†.

* There are ſeveral living credible witneſſes of a man's being dipped, who happening to have a weak, or unſkilful operator, or too long a noſe, part of it was not under the water, query, whether he was properly Baptiſed? eſpecially as ſeveral for part of their faces, or arms, or garments, have been obliged to ſubmit to a ſecond dipping.

† Moſchus narrat de Cenone preſbytero, qui obtentationem quam patiebatur non poterat puellam nudam ſancto oleo inungere: Anointing the Baptized with oil as an emblem of the Holy Ghoſt, being the cuſtom among the eaſterns in the 3d and 4th Centuries.

When

When I reflect upon these things, Sir, I am not only convinced, that Baptism *by dipping*, is a grievous command, and therefore not one of the commandments, mentioned or imply'd in the Doctor's text; but that this way of baptizing, *from the beginning was not so*; never the practice of John Baptist, *much less* of Christ and his Apostles; and never their intention, this external rite should be so administered; as they would certainly have mentioned some qualification *of body*, as well as *of mind*, necessary for christian Ministers; and would not the great head of the Church, think you, have taken care, that his members should never *so universally*, and for so *many centuries*, have departed from the mode of dipping, had it been the only true way? *doubtless*; suffer me to ask you, is it not unreasonable to suppose, that the Savior, who excused his Disciples from the strict observance of the Jewish Sabbath, out of *compassion* to their bodies;* and who assur'd them, when he wash'd their feet, they were *as clean*, as if their whole body was washed†; would appoint a rite or ordinance, that should not only be *indecent* to spectators, and afford *raillery* to gainsayers; but be *grievous*, or attended with *great danger* as to the *health*, and even *life* of his ministers and people? surely as he said, *the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath*, so certainly, *Baptism* was made for *men*, and not men for Baptism.

Nay, Sir, you will excuse my saying that tho' *dipping* evidently appeared to be the scripture practice, (which I can by no means grant, being contrary to my real belief, and which my next Letter shall prove to be contrary likewise to the scripture testimony) yet, as that practice is in cold countries, and from different dresses and customs of people, and of *our nation* in particular, attended with great hazard and several bad effects; I cannot but believe, that he (the compassionate Jesus) who on a similar occasion, quoted and well knew the meaning of the words, *I will have mercy and not sacrifice* ‡, and ma-

* Matt. xii. 3. † John xiii. 10. ‡ Matt. xii. 7.

 nifested

nifeſted his mercy, in various inſtances, not only to the ſouls, but *bodies of men, women and children*; would readily diſpenſe with ſuch a practice; and with pleaſure accept the perſon, as *truly baptis'd*, and a real member of his Church, who had a ſmall quantity of water *poured* upon him, as well as he, who was *overwhelmed* in it*.

This, Sir, I was going to ſay, even yourſelf muſt allow when you conſider; how *all your brethren*, as well as other denominations of chriſtians, have deviated from our Lord's own form, and way of adminiſtring, and partaking of the other external rite, the Lord's ſupper: Who uſes *unleavened bread*; or thinks that *one leaf* is eſſential to the ordinance? who adheres ſtrictly to the *time*, and *form* of the firſt ſupper's being adminiſter'd; or makes conſcience of *leaning* on one another, or *reclining on couches*, when they receive the elements? Alas, Sir, why ſhould the *mode* of one ordinance be ſo zealouſly contended for, more than the other; or why ſhould a larger or leſs quantity of water, be thought *more eſſential* to baptiſm, than that of bread and wine is in the ſupper? Which laſt is certainly as *ſolemn*, as *divine*, and as *uſeful* an ordinance as Baptiſm, and with which therefore, *greater liberties* ought not to be taken, than with the other.

Whether I have demonſtrated, that no ſuch great ſtreſs ought to be laid *on dipping*, as the Doctor doth; granting 'twas the ſcripture practice; or whether I have convinced you, that the ordinance of Baptiſm, *by dipping*, in this and other countries, is *grievous*; much more *diſagreeable*, *painful*, and *dangerous*, than even *circumciſion*, muſt reſt with you: But that no more profeſſing chriſtians, may be under a temptation to obey a *grievous command*, (not of Chriſt's but) *of Dr. Gill's*, and his bigotted anceſtors of *two centuries paſt*, or comply, with what

* Under the Moſaic diſpenſation, which laid ſuch great ſtreſs upon rites and ceremonies, we find they were frequently and lawfully diſpenſed with †; and even *circumciſion*, though enjoined to be performed on the eighth day, under an awful penalty, was omitted for 40 years. Joſhua v. 5.

† Matt. xii. ver. 1 to 8.

may be too juſtly ſtiled *will worſhip*; you will excuſe my publiſhing a copy of this to the world.

In my next, by your indulgence, I'll take notice of what the learned Doctor hath advanced on the mode of Baptiſm: Tho' after proving it, in *his way* grievous; and from ſcripture, lawfully to be diſpenſed with, (ſuppoſing dipping was the practice in warm climates) it may ſeem unneceſſary: however, as he hath in his Sermon, treated all that differ from him, as *fools*, *unlearned*, *ignorant of the ſcriptures*, *and unclean*; I ſhall lay before you the ſtrong proofs there are from ſcripture, that perſons are as *lawfully and properly baptiſed*, by having water *ſprinkled*, or *pour'd* upon them, when *Infants*; as when *dipped* at *adult years*. Hoping to be ſtill numbered among your moſt ſincere friends,

I am,

Your's, &c.

LETTER IV.

Proves that chriſtian Baptiſm, is lawfully adminiſtered by ſprinkling.

SIR,

IN my laſt, I freely offered you my thoughts on dipping; and could not but conclude from ſeveral particulars 'twas a *grievous command*; and therefore never could proceed from Chriſt, the great and compaſſionate head of the Church; nor ſhould be conformed to, by any of his members: But as I promiſed to ſend you ſome of the chief arguments, for adhering to a mode of Baptiſm, different from that which you approve; and as I have been call'd upon, by your warm brother *Dr. Gill*, to give a reaſon of my belief in this particular; the following is ſubmitted to your candid and ſerious peruſal.

The ſcriptural mode of Baptiſm, is *only by dipping*, ſays the Doctor; but as I have prov'd him *beſides himſelf* with reſpect to his text, I flatter myſelf, I ſhall prove him *miſtaken*, in this point alſo. We will charitably ſuppoſe he was a little *noncompos* (from that feveriſh flow of ſpirits he had) *when he delivered his Sermon*; for *ſince then*, as appears by his printed diſcourſe, he hath found out *another ſenſe* of the word βαπτιζω: Now he ſays, it not only ſignifies to dip or plunge, but alſo *to waſh*; this, Sir is certainly a great conceſſion from *ſo learned a man*; and an impartial perſon would think, chriſtians muſt differ no longer about the mode of Baptiſm; becauſe *to waſh*, in numerous places of ſcripture, implies no more, than a partial application of water to perſons and things, by *ſprinkling* and *pouring*; and very ſeldom, a total immerſion: But his very next words mar all again, and he himſelf proves, that what I ſaid of him, was not a falſe repreſentation, but a *very true one*; "all the Greek lexicons I ever ſaw, ſay the word, in a "ſecondary and conſequential ſenſe, ſignifies indeed "abluo,

" abluo, lavo to wash; but this is, because what is " dipp'd is wash'd *."

So all the learned world still adhere to dipping, being the *only sense* of the word; for they would not have said it signified *to wash*, if what was dipp'd, was not wash'd: But doth the *sagacious Doctor* (who here answers for other men's thoughts) think they would have said, that whatever is wash'd, *is*, and *must be* consequentially dipp'd? if he doth, there are *few learned*, if any besides himself, that do: The several lexicons he hath mentioned in his note, I have seen, and others beside; and they all say βαπτιζω signifies, *to wash*, as well as to dip; and the reasons why they so rendered the word, are best known, I should imagine, by the instances, or sentences they insert, where dipping in many of them is *entirely excluded*. You observe, he calls upon me to name a writer of any note, otherwise minded than himself; I could name him *all* he hath mentioned as for himself; but not to shoot above him, surely he hath seen *Leigh's Critica sacra*, (which if of no note, the Doctor would not himself have made such use of) doth not that *Critic* say " βαπτιζω *sumitur pro quocunque genere ablu-* " *tionis, prolutionis, seu mundationis, etiam illius cui mul-* " *la immersionis species adest* †." What can be plainer, Sir, from this critic, as well as from *every lexicon* you consult; than that the word includes all kinds of washing, and those, where there is not the least appearance *of dipping*; doth not Leigh likewise expressly declare, the word *infert aspergere*, tho' the Doctor hath said, none he ever saw, rendered the word *perfundo*, or *aspergo*, to *pour* or *sprinkle*: Now as the Doctor hath led his people into so gross a mistake, as to think all the *learned world* are on his and their side; he ought *in justice* to undeceive them; and honestly from the *pulpit*, as well as the *press*, to tell them, that the *Lexicographers* and *critics* he hath mentioned from time to time, (as well as

* Sermon, p. 22. the note.

† Leigh critica sacra, p. 54. Amstel. Edit. 1696.

Dr.

Dr. Caſaubon and *Grotius*, whom thro' diſtreſs he hath preſſed into his ſervice in his notes,) were all not only *Paedobaptiſts*, but were *ſprinkled alſo*; and would never be dipp'd afterwards, knowing from the general and ſtrict ſenſe of the word βαπτιζω, *they were properly baptiz'd before**.

But as the *learned* in their works, *univerſally* inform us, there are *Baptiſms* or waſhings, without dipping; let us next ſee what is the *ſcripture teſtimony*, of which you know the Doctor ſometimes affects to be very fond. The Apoſtle, Heb. ix. 10. ſays, that under the Jewiſh diſpenſation, there were *divers waſhings*, (διαφοροις βαπτισμοις,) *different kinds*, or ſorts of Baptiſms; what they were, he mentions, as v. 13. *the blood of Bulls and Goats, was ſprinkled on the unclean perſon for the purifying of his fleſh*; in the 19 ver. he ſays, *Moſes ſprinkled the people and the book of the law*, with blood and water; and in the 21ſt v. adds, *that the tabernacle and all its veſſels were ſprinkled likewiſe with blood*; and by theſe Baptiſms or *ſprinklings*, all things under the law were purified: So when a Leper was to be cleanſed, or his infectious houſe to be purified; the Prieſt was to *ſprinkle* them, with blood and running water ſeven times†; and even the Levites, when they were ſeparated for the immediate ſervice of God, were cleanſed, devoted and ſet apart, not by dipping the whole body into water, but by *ſprinkling* water upon them‡. Now thoſe *ſprinklings*, the Apoſtle expreſly calls *Baptiſms*; ſo that here are Baptiſms, Sir, with *ſprinkling*, excluſive of dipping.

Again; as the Doctor confeſſes his *Lexicons* inform

* Dr. Owen, famous for his great knowledge of the Greek language, tho' perhaps Dr. Gill may call him an unlearned and ignorant man, thus ſpeaks; "No one inſtance can be given "in the ſcripture where βαπτιζω neceſſarily ſignifies either to "dip or to plunge" —— "I muſt ſay and will make it good "that no honeſt man who underſtands the Greek tongue, can "deny the word to ſignify to waſh as well as to dip." Serm. &c. p. 581.

† Lev. xiv. 7, 51. ‡ Numb. viii. 7.

him,

him, that βαπτιζω signifies λεω lavo *to waſh**; I will give him an inſtance of the uſe of this laſt word in the *ſeptuagint*, Dan. iv. 23, and 25. where the tree and Nebuchadnezzar are both ſaid to be wet, *ſtrictly*, 'tis *waſhed*, or *baptiſed*, with the dew of Heaven; and if this will not ſatisfy him, let him read on to the 33 ver. and there he will find even the primitive of βαπτιζω,† uſed in the ſame ſenſe; *and his body* εβαφη *was baptiſed with the dew of Heaven*; an expreſſion which will puzzle *Dr. Gill's ſagacity*, to account for any other way, than by the clouds *ſprinkling* or *pouring* drops of rain upon him; tho' doubtleſs 'tis as proper (and not more ridiculous) to ſay, he was dipped *with* or *in* the dew of heaven; as to aſſert, like the Doctor, that men were dipped *in* or *with* a Cloud, in and with the Holy Ghoſt and fire‡.

We will now come to the New Teſtament, Sir, where one or two inſtances out of many muſt ſuffice. You remember I aſked him, whether the Jews plung'd their whole bodies in water, every time before they did eat; and whether they dipped their Pots, brazen Veſſels and Beds. Theſe queſtions were not improper, as Βαπτιζω is uſed in both inſtances; and were ſuch plain proofs for Baptiſm, by a *partial application* of water, that one would have thought all, but a notorious caviller, muſt have been *ſpeechleſs*; but he hath found ſome *cabaliſtical legends*, which ſay, "that the Phariſees and more ſuper-"ſtitious part of the Jews every day before they ſat "down to meat, dip'd the whole body; and thus alſo "they ſerved their veſſels, tables, and even beds, bolſ-"ters and pillows, dipping them, part by part‖." The

* The ſtiff Dr. Gale, Serm. V. Vol. II. p. 311. confeſſes this word is uſed for Baptiſm, and thus explains 1 Cor. vi. 11. απελουσασθε *ye are waſhed*, ye are in Baptiſm waſhed from all your ſins. I leave Dr. Gill to vindicate the ſentiment.

† Βαπτω. ‡ Sermon, p. 26, 28.

‖ Serm. Note, p. 22, 23. If the Doctor would publiſh a diſſertation on the Jewiſh beds, their ſhape, length, breadth, thickneſs and weight, of what ſtuff made, and with what filled, feathers or what elſe that would bear dipping part by part, ſo often and without damage, &c. &c. he would certainly greatly oblige the public, and the learned in particular.

next

next time you see him, Sir, ask him, whether they did not also dip their garments and meal, wine, oil, milk, salt, and every other thing they brought from market? But to be sure they did, for the same reason for which they dipped their whole bodies; if their *bodies* were unclean, so were their *garments*, and so *every thing* that they touched.

But when he observes (after Scaliger, and we shall soon meet with some more on whom he pins his faith, not daring one would think to read the Scriptures, and think for himself) "that because the superstitious part of "the Jews, always dipped the whole body before they "sat down to meat, hence arose the Pharisees admira-"tion at Christ, Luke xi. 38." Surely, the most *credulous Papist* cannot believe him. Scripture says, *the Pharisee marvelled, that ου πρωτον εβαπτισθη he was not first baptized*; what by plunging the whole body into water? Yes, says the Doctor, for otherwise he could not *properly be baptized:* But should not one text illustrate another? We are told, Mark vii. 4. *that the Pharisees when they came from market, εαν μη βαπτισωνται unless they were baptized, did not eat*; but the third verse informs us, 'twas their *hands* only, that they baptized, or washed before they did eat; and this led them to marvel, and find fault with Christ, because he and his Disciples ate with unwashen hands, ver. 5. Nothing, Sir, can be *more demonstrable*, than that the Pharisees admiration, was not because he did not dip his whole body every time before he ate; but that he sat down to meat without first *baptizing*, or washing his hands *. But even granting the Doctor, that the *superstitious part* of the Jews, did plunge themselves all over, every time before they did eat; (which is highly improbable) what Scripture warrant had they for so doing, or even for washing their hands? Did not our Lord immediately reprove them, in that they neglected the Commandments of God, and held the traditions of men? *Sprinkling* the water of separation on unclean persons and things,

* The manner of washing their hands, according to Scripture, was not by dipping them, but by pouring water upon them, as Elisha pour'd water on the hands of Elijah. 2 Kings, iii. 11.

was

was all that God required, and would not that, Sir, have been ſufficient? The Doctor knows, that the *moſt ſolemn purifications* under the law, were always by *ſprinkling*; and there is not an inſtance in all the Bible, of a Prieſt's, or any other perſon's plunging another *into*, or *under the water*, for his ſeparation or cleanſing. But I will not enlarge here; let the *Chriſtian Phariſees*, imitate their *brethren* among the Jews, and uſe water *as often*, and in as *large quantities* as they pleaſe; but let them not trouble the Church of Chriſt, and deſpiſe their Chriſtian brethren, who are not quite ſo ſuperſtitious; who think with their Lord, John xiii. 10. that water applied but to one part of the body, *the feet*, or *the face*, is of as much ſervice, as though it were to the whole body: 'Tis certainly, Sir, not the quantity of water, any more than of the bread and wine, that makes the ordinances of Chriſt a whit more *valid*, or *effectual*.

Another Scripture proof that Baptiſm is properly adminiſtered by *ſprinkling*, is Matt. iii. 11. John told his auditors *that one was coming, who would baptize them with the Holy Ghoſt and with fire*; what can be plainer, than that Βαπτιζω ſignifies here to ſprinkle, excluſive of all other ſenſes? But according to Dr. Gill, the Baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt, (which is uniformly ſpoken of in Scripture, by being *poured out upon*, and by an *unction*, or *anointing*, and by *reſting* on the Apoſtles, in the form of cloven fiery tongues) proves notwithſtanding, that Baptiſm is by *immerſion*, or *overwhelming as in a pool*; he hath produced one Doctor to back him in this ridiculous explanation*; but if one man is a little whimſical, ſhall I adopt his conceits and pay an *implicit faith* to his fanciful notions? Adviſe the Doctor, Sir, to ſee with his own eyes and judge for himſelf, and be the *conſiſtent Proteſtant*. To do the Doctor juſtice however, *in print* he doth not ſay, the Baptiſm of the Apoſtles with the Spirit was actual immerſion; *no*, "A ruſhing "mighty wind filled all the houſe where they were ſitting "ſo that they were *as if* immerſed into and covered with "it, and therefore very properly called a Baptiſm." Now, Sir, when he wrote his ſermon and animadverſions,

* Sermon, pag. 27.

very probably, the room where he sat was *full of smoke*; and so he was *as if* immersed into and covered with it; and surely this may *as properly* be stiled a Baptism, as that of wind. But the Doctor certainly followed Dr. *Casaubon*, rather than the Scripture; for there is not a word in the Bible of wind's filling the room; but 'twas a *sound* or noise from heaven like as of a rushing mighty wind, that filled the house; *and so they were as if immersed into, and covered with sound: As if immersed*, that is as if baptized; a very pretty way, Sir, of *evading* and coming off; and the same ingenuity and art, he uses in his reasoning and remarks, on the Israelites being baptized in the cloud, and in the sea. When preaching, you remember he said, "The sea stood upon each side of them, "and the cloud above covered them, and so they were "all baptized by immersion." *Annotator divine!* Now he says, "the waters standing up as a wall on each side "of them through which, and the cloud over their "heads under which, they passed; they were *like* persons "immersed in water *." Truly, not quite *so wet*, no *likeness* at all, as to the effects, on either cloaths or persons; he quotes *Grotius* as on his side, respecting this text, and I could quote him, Sir, *on my side*, both as to the subjects and mode of Baptism, if that was requisite; but who should we believe? The *Apostle*, or rather the *Holy Ghost*, who says, The Apostles were *actually baptized* with the Spirit; and that the Israelites were *actually baptized* unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea; or Dr. *Gill* and other *fallible men*; who to answer a turn, would make them nothing but *allusions* to Baptism, and say, those expressions mean no other, than they were, *as if baptized, for there was some likeness in it, they were like persons immersed in water* †: Though the learned Doctor says, "This may with great propriety be called a Baptism, "that is by immersion;" I cannot believe, he would receive a person into his church, that was thus baptized, either after the manner of the Apostles, or the Israelites; or that were only *like persons* immersed in water; he certainly was encompassed with *a cloud*, when he thought of producing this last instance, for Baptism *by immersion*; or he must mistake, and mean the Egyptians for the Israelites, as the

* pag. 26. † Sermon and note, pag. 26.

persons

perſons *properly baptized* or covered with the ſea: The Iſraelites were baptized by immerſion *in* the cloud, and the *cloud far above them*; baptized *in* the ſea, and *no water approached them*; baptized with what then? Why, *with nothing:* Which (to uſe the Doctor's own words) is as *monſtrouſly ridiculous*, as to ſay we are baptized by circumciſion; which he would inſinuate I have done; but as I proved to you, he over-acted the *Grammarian* in the Greek, 'tis no wonder, he doth in his *mother tongue*.

The explanation I gave of the text, that they were baptiſed *in the cloud*, by its diſtilling drops of rain upon them; and *in the ſea*, by the ſpray of the waves agitated by the ſtrong wind that blew, as they were paſſing through the channel of the ſea; you know he ſays, "is a mere "conceit, a wild imagination, and contrary to the ſacred "ſcriptures; and if there was a continual ſpray, how could "they paſs through the ſea on dry ground *?" *How indeed!* Inform him, Sir, they paſſed not through the ſea at all, the ſea retired on each ſide of them, and the *ſcripture aſſerts*, that a ſtrong eaſt wind blew; and if that was the caſe, there muſt be *another miracle*, to prevent the ſpray of the waves: But let us *condeſcend to men of low degree*; ſuppoſe the Doctor was to walk through London ſtreets in a ſhower of rain, ſtill might he not be ſaid to walk on dry ground? to be ſure, or *as if* on dry ground. Granting what I ſaid was a whimſical notion, yet ſurely it is not quite ſo abſurd, as to ſay they were baptized or immerſed *with a cloud*, and *with nothing*; or make them out to be only *as if*, or *like* perſons baptized; and to repreſent the Apoſtles as baptized *with wind*, and *with ſound*.

But what ſhall I ſay to, or of him, Sir, when he declares he never yet met with any *learned man* that ever aſſerted it†: Hath he never read any thing but *Jewiſh fables*, or doth he think others ſo unprofitably have ſpent their time? Or who pray doth he eſteem learned? I could name him *twenty*, more learned than himſelf, who aſſert that the Iſraelites were baptized in the cloud, by

* Sermon, page 26. Note. † Ibid.

its *ſprinkling water* upon them; and I could name ſeveral, that far exceed the *famous Dr. Gill*, in *all branches* of learning, who ſpake of their being baptized in the ſea, by the ſpray of its waves; but out of the mouth of two or three let it be confirmed. Not to mention learned foreigners, as *Wolfius*, &c. You know, Sir, that *Dr. Goodwin**, *Mr. Locke* †, *Dr. Watts* ‡, and *Dr. Guyſe* ‖ believed they were thus baptized, and therefore ſaid and publiſhed it. Who, think you, is ignorant of the controverſy, or rather who is the very illiberal man? (for Dr. Gill muſt know the ſentiments of the *great Dr. Goodwin*, as he in many places ſtiles him, if he did not of the others §.) I pretend not to be a prophet; but as Dr. Gill will not have the vanity to compare himſelf with the *gentlemen* I have mentioned; ſo *their memories* will be precious, when his is forgotten; and *their writings* will live, and be extenſively uſeful, when his are covered with

* "The ſacraments extraordinarily and peculiarly adminiſtered to the Iſraelites, were types of ours; they came near "the life, the ſprinkling or mizling of the rain in the cloud "and going through the Red ſea, was even to the vulgar view "a viſible baptizing." Vol. 5. Part 2. page 149.

† "The Apoſtle calls it Baptiſm, which is the initiating ceremony into both the Jewiſh and Chriſtian church; and that the children of Iſrael were waſhed with rain from the cloud, may be collected from Pſalm lxviii. 9." Locke's Works, V. 3. p. 180.

‡ "The children of Iſrael were baptized unto Moſes in the "cloud and the ſea in their paſſage through the Red ſea; not "that they were dipped in the water, but they were ſprinkled "by the clouds over their heads, and perhaps by the water "which ſtood up in heaps as they paſſed by." Watts's Works, V. 1. p. 821.

‖ "If it be ſuppoſed that here is any alluſion to the mode "of Baptiſm, it refers rather to ſprinkling than immerſion, "ſince the Egyptians that were drowned in the ſea, were bap"tized by the waters covering them, rather than the Iſraelites, "that went on dry land, and could be no other way waſhed "than with drops that might fall from the cloud, and the daſh"ings of the waves." Guyſe's Paraphraſe in locum. Note.

§ "No leſs a perſon than the great Dr. Goodwin, whoſe "works I much value and eſteem." Gill's Doctrine of Juſtification, p. 18.

duſt

duſt and cobwebs in a corner of a ſhelf, or meet with a treatment too indelicate for me to mention. His contemptuous uſage of *ſuch characters*, extorted this from me; but I haſten, Sir, to his proofs,

That Baptiſm muſt be *by immerſion*; if not from the proper ſignification of the word Βαπτιζω, yet from the places where the rite was performed; firſt, *in Jordan*; but he hath not diſproved, that it may full as properly be ſaid, *at* or *with* the river Jordan: a *mere novice* in the Greek language, knows that εν ſignifies *with* or *at*, as well as *in*; and accordingly it is rendered *at*, in above an hundred places of the New Teſtament, and as often, *with*: Why ſhould it not be ſaid then, that John baptized *with* the water of the river Jordan, or that he baptized *at* Jordan, as well as *in* Jordan? No, ſays Dr. Gill, not in that place; but in another, where εν is rendered *with*, he ſays it ſhould be read *in* *; ſo, *with*, may and ſhould be altered for *in*, but not *in* for *with*; but whatever he may ſay, to baptize *in the Holy Ghoſt*, and *in fire*, are uncouth and very unuſual phraſes; and nothing but *a great ſtrait*, could have forced him to give the words ſuch a turn.

Well, but "John baptized alſo at Enon, which he "choſe for this reaſon, becauſe there was much water "there; now if Baptiſm was not by immerſion, what need "was there to make choice of rivers and places abound-"ing with water to baptize in †?" You know, Sir, the Greek is υδατα πολλα *many waters*, or different collections of water; and there were ſeveral reaſons, might lead him to chuſe ſuch a place beſides immerſion: The *numbers* that went to ſee and hear him, and the *heat of the climate*, called for a great ſupply of water, for drink, refreſhment, and other neceſſary uſes; and that the people might have a plenty of water near at hand, for theſe purpoſes, he might chuſe the places he did, without the *leaſt reſpect to dipping*.

Ah, "but Philip and the Eunuch went down both "into the water and came up out of it; and they muſt

* Ib. page 23. † Sermon, page 28. Note.

"go

" go *into* the water (that is be immerſed in it) becauſe it " is expreſly ſaid before, they were come *to it*, where- " fore they went not unto it, if they were there before, " but *into* it *." I can hardly forbear, Sir, adopting another of his polite words, *Wiſeacre!* Suppoſe, he was riding in a chariot, and came to the water ſide, if then he condeſcended to ſtep out of it, to waſh his face, hands, &c. may it not be ſtrictly ſaid, that though he was come to the water before, yet in coming down from the chariot, he went down unto the water; which ſo far from implying his being plunged into it, doth not lead us to think his ſhoe was ſo much as wetted; beſides, if going into the water, implies immerſion, Philip muſt be dipped as well as the Eunuch; for it is ſaid, *they went down both into the water*; and if the Eunuch really went into the water, before plunged in, he *half baptized himſelf*; as indeed do all the Doctor's Proſelytes, if being covered with water is Baptiſm.

Becauſe he harped ſo much on *into*, and *out of*; you remember I aſked him, " how many times he muſt be " told, that the Greek particles, or prepoſitions εις and " εκ ſignify *unto* and *from*; and are thus rendered in " hundreds of places in the New Teſtament;" and appealed to him, whether, " They went down *unto* the water, " and came up *from* it; was not as proper, if not a more " eligible and juſt reading than the other:" but if he would inſiſt on *into* the water, I aſked him, " what he " would make of Chriſt's going *into* a mountain?" Really, Sir, by his anſwer, he hath proved himſelf the *wiſeſt man* among you, bleſſed with the fartheſt, if not with the gift of *ſecond ſight:* Surely, he hath found *a cave* in the mountain, ſo that our Lord in entring it, may properly be ſaid to go into the mountain †: That is, he was *as if*, or *actually* immerſed, or overwhelmed, or baptized *in* and *with earth*. This is certainly the tip-top of all; pity he had not ſhewn his remarks to you or ſome other judicious friend, before he publiſhed them to the world with this *wonderful*, *highly probable cave*. To what ſhifts

* Sermon, Note, page 24. † Sermon, page 25. Note.

are the *votaries of bigotry* often reduced! But how did he know, Sir, I meant the mountain, Luke vi. 12. rather than that Matt. v. 1. Is it not εις το ορος *into a mountain*, in one place, as well as the other? But this *laſt text* would have proved even to his people and admirers, there was no cave there, or that Jeſus did not go into one; for then how could the multitude hear him? I hear you ſay, he certainly went up *into*, or *aſcended* this mountain, not to pray alone, but to preach to a multitude.——You obſerve the Doctor is a little ſhaken about the proper meaning of εις; and now like a *ſcholar*, modeſtly ſays, "it "muſt be allowed, the prepoſition ſometimes at leaſt "ſignifies *into* *." Yes, *often*; and the Doctor ſhall be conſtrained ſoon, to acknowledge it *very often* ſignifies *unto*, and *to*, and not *into*. Give him from me the following example or two: But firſt, refer him to himſelf, Romans iv. 3. 5. 9. we meet with εις δικαιοσυνην, which he ſtrenuouſly maintains, is, *UNTO righteouſneſs*, and ſo again Rom. x. 10†. Beg him to conſider alſo 1 Theſſ. iii. 12. where εις occurs three times, and muſt be rendered *unto*, or *towards*, which you pleaſe: So Matt. xv. 24. Our Lord ſays he was ſent εις τα προβατα, &c. Should that be *to* or *into the loſt ſheep?* *To*, you reply, doubtleſs; unleſs the loſt ſheep had a *cave in them*, as well as the mountain; though the Doctor's criticiſm will ſuit very well with the tenet of ſome, and furniſh them with an *invincible argument* for tranſubſtantiation and Chriſt's entering perſonally into them; their ſtomach is the cave into which he goes, by virtue of hoc eſt corpus, vel *hocus pocus*. Aye, but ſays the Doctor, "circumſtances "require εις ſhould be rendered *into* ſometimes, particu-"larly in Acts viii. 38:" that is εις connected *with water*, muſt neceſſarily ſignify *into*. But you know the contrary, Sir; Jeſus ſent Peter εις την θαλασσαν ‡; what *into the ſea?* No, only *to*, for he had *a line and hook* to caſt into it. I hope theſe few inſtances, out of numbers that might be produced, will ſatisfy him; and engage him to complain no more of *partial*, and *non tranſlations*; but make him ingenuouſly to acknowledge, that *party*

* Ibid. † Doctrine of Juſtification, page 16.
‡ Matt. xvii. 27.

zeal,

zeal, and a fond desire of being esteemed the *head of a sect*, hath made him thus long impose on himself, and them that hear him.

There is but one thing in his sermon and remarks on the mode of Baptism, that remains unnoticed and unanswered; and that is so weak an one, that the bare mentioning thereof, Sir, is sufficient to expose it. "The "end of Baptism is to represent the burial and resurrec- "tion of Christ, which cannot be answered any other "way than by immersion; and hence the Apostle says, "*buried with him by Baptism*, and *in Baptism* *." What, Sir, is a representation of the burial and Resurrection of Christ, *the end of Baptism?* I always thought the end of Baptism, was to distinguish Christians from Infidels; to receive persons into God's visible church; to instruct mankind in their guilt and defilement through sin; to hold forth to them the necessity of sanctification; to signify the influences of the spirit; and to oblige them who were partakers of it, to observe the law and all the precepts of him, into whose name they were baptized. So the end of Baptism, is with Antipædobaptists only an emblem of the burial and Resurrection of Christ, if Dr. Gill is their oracle: But if this is really the case, I wonder how any believer in Christ, or how any rational creature complies with it; for the emblem is imperceptible, but by one or two of uncommon capacities. You know the Doctor vaunts, "will any man in his senses "say a corps is buried, when only a little dust or earth "is sprinkled or poured on its face †?" But can *any man in his senses*, not to say a D. D; assert that a person's going by himself to the middle in water, and then joining with the minister, to put the *other half* of himself a few inches under water, and being pulled up again in three moments; is the *representation* and emblem of *Christ's burial and resurrection*, or hath the *least analogy* or resemblance to it? Alas, Sir, were we to frame articles of faith for ourselves and others, from what *some men* will make scripture allusions, and their whimsical interpretations of them; what would become of Christianity?

* Sermon, page 25. † Ibid.

The

The Doctor knows, or ſhould know, that φωτισθεντας Heb. vi. 4. is generally underſtood to mean perſons baptized; and the Greek and Latin fathers in common ſpoke of Baptiſm under the word φωτισμος, from men's being in Baptiſm tranſlated out of the kingdom of darkneſs into that of grace and light, and from their being by the Baptiſm of the ſpirit enlightened with the rays of the goſpel and divine light as with thoſe of the Sun *; now, if dipping be the ſcripture mode of Baptiſm, nothing is more oppoſite to this *ſcripture alluſion* of Baptiſm by irradiation; for the water prevents the ſight, and for a time makes *all darkneſs* around them; beſides, are not Chriſtians ſaid, to be *crucified with Chriſt*, and to be *planted together in the likeneſs of his death*; ſurely by the ſame rule, that we are plunged into water, to be buried with Chriſt in Baptiſm, and to ſhew we have fellowſhip with him alſo in his overwhelming ſufferings; which the Doctor ſays "are agreeable to Baptiſm by immerſion †," we may not only be *ſigned with the Croſs*, but ought to be *faſtened to one*, this laſt, being truly the *ſtrongeſt repreſentation*, and emblem of our being crucified with Chriſt, and being planted together in the likeneſs of his death: But why doth he inſiſt on ſcripture alluſions? You know, Sir, where *one* makes for him, *three* are againſt him; are not the beſt of divine bleſſings promiſed and expreſſed by "*pouring out water upon him* "*that is thirſty*, *by ſprinkling many nations*, by, *ſprinkling* "*clean water upon us*, by, *the blood of ſprinkling*, by, *ſprinkling* "*of the blood of Jeſus*, by, *the Holy Ghoſts being ſhed*, εξε- "χεεν *poured out upon us*, by *an unction*, *or anointing from* "*the holy one*, *&c. &c*;" do not all theſe more clearly favour; and more fully prove the *mode* of Baptiſm to be by *ſprinkling*, than any he can produce for *dipping*? To borrow the Doctor's words with a little variation; what a pity it is the tranſlators of our Bible had not rendered the word Βαπτιζω *to ſprinkle*, as you know they truly might; for want of it, the controverſy is ſtill continued by *watery bigots*; and many ignorant ſprinkled Chriſtians are often (to their hurt) pulled by them into the water; yet, though the word is not thus tranſlated, but left at

* Hence the days, on which Baptiſm was adminiſtered, were ſtiled ημεραι των φωτων, days of light, and the baptized were called φωτιζομενοι.

† Sermon, page 27.

large, implying all kinds of washings and applications of water; we have *proofs sufficient*, that Baptism was, and ought to be performed by *sprinkling* *.

Besides, the determination of the *Greek Lexicons* in its favour; besides, the *Baptism of the Israelites* in the cloud and in the sea, which could be no other way, than by drops of water sprinkled on them, from the cloud and the waves; besides, the *Baptisms under the law*, which were never administered by Moses, or any of the Priests, to persons and things but by sprinkling; besides, the *Baptism of the Holy Ghost*, which according to scripture, was by his descending and resting on the Apostles, and is uniformly spoken of, as being shed and poured out †; besides, the *New Testament proofs*, that the Pharisees and others are called baptized, when only their hands were washed, by pouring water upon them; and so their tables and beds are stiled baptized, when water was (and could be) only sprinkled upon them; besides, the just meaning of the *Greek prepositions* εις and εκ *to* and *from*, and the numerous places that can be produced where they are, and must necessarily be so rendered; besides, the *scripture allusions* of all divine blessings, under the phrases, *sprinkled and poured out*; besides the *ancient seal* of God's covenant with his people; and *initiating ordinance* into his church, to which Baptism succeeded, being applied but to one part of the body; besides, our *Lord's express declaration*, that the washing of the feet, (a less noble part of the body than the face) with a bason of water, was as effectual as if the whole body had been washed; besides all these strong arguments, not to add Nebuchadnezzar's Baptism with the dew of heaven; let but Christians consider, the *multitudes* that were baptized at Jordan and Enon, who scarcely went out provided with

* "This symbol of sprinkling was that which God himself "chose, and appointed as a meet and apt token of the com- "munication of covenant mercy.—This rite of sprinkling, "was that alone in all sacrifices whereby their continued effica- "cy unto purification was expressed, thence is the blood of "Christ called the blood of sprinkling, because of its efficacy "unto sanctification, as applied by faith." Owen on the Hebrews, Vol. 3. p. 378. 435.

† Acts ii. 33.

changes

changes of raiment for dipping; let them reflect on the *three thousand*, that were converted and baptized in one day, yea in a few hours in the city of Jerusalem; who could not have time to go to their respective homes for other dresses, and if dipped naked, as we may charitably suppose some women among them, how indecent and immodest, yea what a hubbub would it have made in the streets of the holy city? Or who that reads of the jailor and his family being baptized at *midnight* in his own house, can think it was by dipping; and even in the case of the Eunuch *it is improbable*, as he was then journeying.

Really, Sir, I have often wondered, how you especially, or any of your denomination, can withstand such powerful evidence, if not *demonstration*, from reason and scripture, for Baptism being lawfully administered by *sprinkling*. If the Doctor will continue to urge the practice of the superstitious Jews, in washing the whole body; ask him, why he doth not make his Proselytes imitate them altogether? If the whole body must be washed, it is necessary it be uncloathed, else the body is very little more affected, or wet, than by water's being poured on the face; but if needless, why do our brethren so insist on a person's being plunged entirely under water: It is well known, that some (if not for their noses) for part of their *garments* being above water, have been overwhelmed again; but is not this being *superstitious*, and *contentious* about dipping cloaths *. It is unaccountably strange, that Dr. Gill or any man, should censure Papists for baptizing *Bells*, &c. and yet quarrel with his pious brethren, and divide the Church of Christ, about *baptizing garments*: I see no reason to retract, what I once said, respecting his performance; that something besides Dr. Gill's knowledge and learning, must be questioned.

Though I have spoken my mind freely to you; I am persuaded, you will not consider and pray for me, as "one "of the blind Sodomites groping in the dark, seeking

* Baptismus vero sive immersio, non vestium est, sed humani corporis. Vossius de Baptismo.

" the living among the dead," which you remember, was a petition offered up by one of the Doctor's lay preachers, immediately after ſermon, on behalf of poor ſprinkled Chriſtians: But to do him juſtice, he prayed likewiſe (forgetting I ſuppoſe all that his Doctor had juſt before ſaid againſt ſprinkling) that we might all be *ſprinkled* with the blood of Chriſt: In return, may he, the Doctor, and all bigots of every party and ſect, be covered with humility, and have a large unction of Chriſtian love and charity!

You may ſay, what avails this long letter about the *mode of Baptiſm*, as I know that the *Antipædobaptiſts* in Holland, think it immaterial whether perſons are dipped, or ſprinkled, and do ſprinkle or pour water on moſt that they baptize; and you add, the *proper ſubjects*, is the chief point of controverſy: I grant it, and therefore ſhall ſoon lay before you, ſome of the chief arguments, that Baptiſm ought to be adminiſtered to the children of Chriſtian parents, with great eſteem, I am,

Yours, &c.

LETTER V.

Proves that Infants are lawful Members of Christ's Church.

SIR,

WITH the same freedom, as I communicated my thoughts to you on the *mode*, in my last letter; in this I shall speak of the *subjects* of Christian Baptism. That water Baptism is a divine institution, and to be much esteemed, and duly observed by Christians, we are agreed in; though perhaps still differ as to the quantity of water to be used in it, and the way of its being applied to the body; but this is with me, not so material, were we agreed as to the proper subjects: But notwithstanding all Dr. Gill's shrewd animadversions, and *polite language* bestowed on me, I cannot but still differ from him, and you in this point. You remember, that he said, I injuriously represented him, as to his treatment of all those that differ'd from him; but that the charge of his representing the Pædobaptists, as *unlearned*, and *ignorant of the Scriptures*, is just, my last letter sufficiently proved; as doth his own sermon: All the learned to be sure, know that Βαπτιζω signifies *only to dip or plunge*; if they say it denotes secondarily, *to wash*, 'tis because what is dipped is washed: And surely the Pædobaptists have not *one text of Scripture* in proof of Baptism by sprinkling; and yet *wonderful!* All these same learned men would never be dipped, and the whole Christian world (a few hundred persons excepted) will not renounce sprinkling for themselves, or their children.

But ad rem, view the Doctor in print; "The Bap-"tism of infants must be wrong; since there is no com-"mand of God and Christ for it *; and as there is no "precept for the Baptism of infants, so no precedent "for it in the word of God †; I defy the whole world "to give one single precedent, I condemn it as unscrip-"tural and unwarrantable ‡; and where is the good

* Sermon, pag. 11. † Ibid, p. 15. ‡ pag. 17.

"sense

" ſenſe, it is an abſurdity of abſurdities to affirm that " Baptiſm comes in the room of circumciſion * :" *Well done Goliah!* Who would but have thee for a *Champion!* You know, Sir, when preaching he bad defiance oftner by far; but don't the words he acknowledges in print, very plainly prove, that he actually repreſented the greater part of the Chriſtian world, as *fools*, and *ignorant of the Scriptures?* And doth not he treat *all children* without exception as *unclean*, not ſuffering them to be admitted into the church of God? How he could inſinuate, that he did not look on Pædobaptiſts as *unclean*, is amazing; when he would not ſit down with one of them at the Lord's Supper, nor admit him into his church as a member, were he Moſes, Elias, St. Paul, or an Angel from heaven.

The only *proper ſubjects* of Baptiſm, are according to the Doctor, " repenting ſinners, believers in Chriſt, diſ- " ciples of Chriſt, and receivers of the Spirit of God." But can any man have the Spirit of God, or of Chriſt, and not be all the reſt? Why ſuch a *fourfold diſtinction* then? The reaſon is obvious, Sir, that he might receive all the profeſſing world into his church, except *harmleſs infants*; Simon Magus profeſſed himſelf a *penitent ſinner*, a believer in and a *Diſciple of Chriſt*, and on this profeſſion, though he had not the Spirit of Chriſt, he was baptized: So that the next time, Dr. Gill brags, " That he hath precedents enough ready, for baptizing " adult perſons believers," You may inform him he hath a Scripture precedent ready, for baptizing an *adult perſon* an unbeliever; but I fear his own experience hath furniſhed too many precedents of this kind: What avails his ſaying, " 'tis time enough to talk of infants Baptiſm, " when 'tis clear and evident, they have the grace of " God in them, and a meetneſs for the kingdom of Hea- " ven," for if he was never to dip any perſon, till that was clear and evident, was he to live Methuſalah's years, he would never baptize another: Surely, *Philip* had as good a *ſpirit of diſcernment* into a man's faith and ſincerity, as the Doctor can pretend to, and yet he baptized Simon Magus; but I fear from the well known zeal of

* pag. 12.

your

your *champion*, let a perſon but make a declaration, that he believes in Chriſt, and deſires to be dipped, he would ſoon go with him, as an *excellent Chriſtian* into the water, to do it: Is there not too great reaſon to ſay, that a deſire to be overwhelmed in water, is the cleareſt proof in the world with ſome, of a *perſon's meetneſs* for the church and table of Chriſt? But I would hope Dr. Gill goes farther, with reſpect to his *people's qualifications and meetneſs* for the kingdom of God above: On this point I cannot but conclude, that as believing parents have ſtrong encouragement, from the covenant of God and his gracious promiſe (which we ſhall ſoon ſee extends to them and their infant ſeed) to devote their children to God in Baptiſm; ſo Miniſters have hence *greater encouragement*, and ſtronger foundation to baptize, and receive them into God's viſible church, than to baptize and receive any, on their own *bare profeſſion*, who may *deceive*, and *impoſe* upon them.

But this leads me to remark, that your *man of war* that bids defiance ſo often to the whole world, is alſo a *man of wit*; "'Tis abſurd to ſend us to the old teſt, for "a command to obſerve a new teſt-ordinance, 'tis a groſs "abſurdity to ſend us ſo far back as to the 17th chapter "of Geneſis, for a warrant for the ordinance of Baptiſm, "we might as well be ſent to the firſt chapter of that "Book *." But, Sir, who ever referred *him*, or any other perſon, to the 17th chap. of Geneſis, to prove *infant Baptiſm?* Yourſelf acknowledged, you remembered none; and confident he could not produce *one* of the leaſt note, I aſked him, whether this was not a wilful miſrepreſentation? And it fully appears to be ſo, for in his anſwer, to prove my ignorance of the controverſy, or rather his own blindneſs, or want of judgment; he ſays, "the very laſt writer on the ſubject," and produces a quotation from that Gentleman's unanſwerable performance †; *a quotation*, which none but one whoſe ſight and reaſon were very near extinguiſhed by bigotry, and ſo could not diſtinguiſh, between *infant Baptiſm*, and the *right of infants to* the initiating ſeal of God's covenant, could ever have produced. It directly proves, what I

* Sermon, pag. 11. † Boſtwick's.

had

had before told him, was as clear as the ſun ſhining at noon day; that God's covenant with Abraham included infants, that they were thereby ordered to have a ſign, the token of his peculiar regard put upon them, and to be ever after conſidered, and treated as members of his church. That this covenant was of grace, not of works, that it had not merely temporal, but chiefly ſpiritual promiſes and bleſſings annexed to it, is moſt evident; as alſo that it includes children with their parents; *I will eſtabliſh my covenant between me and thee, and thy ſeed after thee, in their generations for an everlaſting covenant; to be a God unto thee, and to thy ſeed after thee, and I will give unto thee and to thy ſeed after thee, the land of Canaan for an everlaſting poſſeſſion, and I will be their God* *: Though the land of Canaan is included in this covenant, yet nothing can be plainer, than that the bleſſings of grace and ſalvation, and of eternal life in heaven, typified by the land of Canaan, are included and *chiefly intended* in that comprehenſive promiſe, *I will be their God.* Doth not the promiſe imply an intereſt in all that God hath, and is, ſo far as is neceſſary to the happineſs of a creature? From the genuine ſenſe of the various places where the phraſe occurs afterward in Scripture, *God being our God*, it muſt include grace and glory: Our Savior proved, that the *Covenant was of grace*, and that its bleſſings reached *to eternity*, when he ſilenced the Sadducees with, *I am the God of Abraham*, &c. *God is not the God of the dead but of the living* †: Beſides, Sir, doth not the Apoſtle ſay, *that Jeſus Chriſt was a Miniſter of the circumciſion for the truth of God, to confirm the promiſes made to the fathers, and that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy* ‡? Now who were the fathers, to whom the promiſes were made, but the Patriarchs *Abraham, Iſaac and Jacob?* And what were *theſe promiſes*, but that *God would be their God*, and *the God of their ſeed*, and *that all nations ſhould be bleſſed in the Meſſiah*, that ſhould ſpring from Abraham. Surely the Doctor will not ſay, Chriſt came to confirm the *temporal* and carnal promiſes made to the *natural ſeed* of Abraham; for within forty years after his death, Canaan ceaſed to be their inheritance. But what need I dwell

* Geneſis, xvii. 7. 8.
† Matt. xxii. 32.
‡ Romans, xv. 8, 9.

on

on this, St. Paul in the fourth chapter of the *Romans*, and the third of the *Galatians*, hath *to a demonſtration*, proved that the Covenant made with Abraham was a *ſpiritual one*, and the ſpiritual and eternal bleſſings that were included in it, were *viſibly ſealed to him and his ſeed*, by circumciſion; *and if we be Chriſt's, then are we Abraham's ſeed, and heirs according to the promiſe* *. If an Apoſtle may be believed, the Covenant was of grace, a ſpiritual, and *everlaſting one*, otherwiſe the diſpenſation by Moſes muſt have ſuperceded it; but is not his language, *this I ſay, the Covenant that was confirmed before of God in Chriſt; the law which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot diſannull, that it ſhould make the promiſe of no effect* †: So that 'tis not impertinently nor without reaſon, you ſee, the Doctor *is referred* to the ſeventeenth chapter of Geneſis; not for a *proof of infant Baptiſm*, but for a *proof of God's taking children into Covenant* with him, and ordering a *viſible token* or ſign of it to be ſet upon them, for the comfort of their parents. Now, Sir, ſeeing the Covenant of God is everlaſting, and his promiſe to believers and their ſeed ſtandeth ſure; as the great bleſſing of Abraham was, that his children ſhould be taken into the divine Covenant together with himſelf, that they ſhould have God for their God, and have this promiſe ſealed to them by a divine ceremony; how comes it to paſs, that the children of Abraham's ſpiritual ſeed are excluded the Covenant, and muſt be deprived of the ſeal? Is it not very ſtrange, that *an Apoſtle* ſhould ſay, *The bleſſing of Abraham muſt come on the Gentiles*; and that, *Chriſt came to confirm the promiſes made to Abraham, that the Gentiles might glorify God*; if ſo *great a part* of this bleſſing, and the *contents of the promiſes*, were witheld from the *Gentile church*. Is it not ſtranger ſtill, that *children* ſhould be *included* in the Covenant of grace, and *ordered* to be taken into God's viſible church, and be *continued in for near two thouſand years*; and at the coming of Chriſt be *deprived* of their ſhare of *ſpiritual promiſes and privileges*, be *caſt out* of God's church, be *denied* the viſible ſign and pledge of their relation to God, and be treated as *Scythians* and *Barbarians*. Really, Sir, 'tis *incredible* to think, that children ſhould ſtand in a viſible relation to God,

* Galatians, iii. 29. † Galatians, iii. 17.

under the *law given by Moſes*; and when grace and truth came by Jeſus Chriſt, by *his Goſpel of peace* (which is every where repreſented as increaſing the privileges and bleſſings of mankind, and conferring greater benefits on the people of God, than they enjoyed under Judaiſm) they ſhould be *cut off*, and deprived of the bleſſing: What think you, a Jew would have ſaid, if he found that his believing in Chriſt would exclude his children from the church of God, and the privileges they enjoyed under the Jewiſh diſpenſation *; and what think you, *his children* would have thought of Chriſt and chriſtianity, if as ſoon as their parent became a Chriſtian, they were deprived of all *viſible relation to God, or his Church?* Tell it not at Gath, *publiſh it not to the Jews*, leſt the *circumciſed* ſhould triumph, and be more abundantly hardened in their prejudices and clamor againſt Chriſt and his Goſpel.

I have ſaid, that *children* were members of God's viſible church for near *two thouſand years*, that is from Abraham to Chriſt; but I might have ſaid for *above four thouſand years*; yea I may add that every Covenant God made with men, included children: 'Tis moſt evident that the *Covenant made with Adam*, included his children, and that they were intereſted in it; elſe how came *ſickneſs and death* on his offspring, even *upon them* who ſin not actually, as he had done †? Witneſs alſo that with *Noah* ‡; that with *Abraham* ‖; that with *Moſes and the Iſraelites* §; that with the *Tribe of Levi*, &c. **: Children were ever eſteemed in their *minority*, one with their parents, and treated accordingly. But as children were real members of God's church from the beginning; ſo when the viſible church was to be more conſpicuous, in the days of Abraham *circumciſion* was appointed to him and his children, as a badge of diſtinction, from the reſt of the world, and by

* 'Tis plain from Acts xxi. 20, 21. the believing Jews, thought their children had a right to enter with them into the church of Chriſt, or were proper ſubjects of it, elſe they would not have diſputed about their circumciſion.

† Romans, v. 12—14. ‡ Gen. vi. 18. and ix. 8, 9.

‖ Gen. xvii. 7. § Deut. xxix. 10, 11, 12.

** Numb. iii. 12, 15.

it

it they were received into the church of God; and from that time to the coming of the Meſſiah, this was the *initiating ordinance* into the viſible church; he the Lord of all, changed the rite, and appointed one neither painful nor grievous, *Baptiſm*, in its room. Now, Sir, ſeeing there is not a Covenant mentioned in Scripture as between God and men, in which children were not included; ſeeing children were members of God's viſible church *from the beginning* (for in Adam's family the viſible church began), ſeeing that for *two thouſand years* they were received into it by a *viſible ſign*, or external rite, by *God's expreſs command* (who would have them marked for his property, and at ſeveral times claimed them as his) ſeeing that the *Jewiſh church*, and the *Chriſtian*, are not different churches, but *one and the ſame church of God*, under different adminiſtrations and ordinances; ſeeing that circumciſion and Baptiſm are *ſeals of the ſame Covenant*, and appointed for the *ſame uſe and end*; why ſhould not the members of God's viſible church, conſiſt of the ſame ſubjects *ſince Chriſt*, as before him; why ſhould not the privileges of the members, *parents and their children* be the ſame? Why ſhould not *children of Chriſtians* have an equal right to the ſame promiſes, and to the new and outward ſeal of them; as the *children of Abraham* and *of Iſrael* had to them, and to the old ſeal? Or, ſince neither God nor Chriſt have *revoked their privileges and right*; why ſhould *men cut them off*, declare they are not intereſted in the Covenant of grace, and refuſe to adminiſter that rite to them, by which only their viſible relation to God, and diſtinction from the reſt of mankind is manifeſted, and by which alone they can be received into his church.

You deſire me to conſider what the Doctor hath ſaid on this head, "'tis an abſurdity of abſurdities to affirm, "that Baptiſm comes in the room of circumciſion, ſince "Baptiſm was in force, and uſe, *long before* circumciſion "was aboliſhed; circumciſion was not aboliſhed till the "death of Chriſt, but Baptiſm was adminiſtered *many* "*years before*, to multitudes by John, and by the order "of Chriſt, and by his Apoſtles. Now where is the good "ſenſe of ſaying one thing ſucceeds another, when the "one ſaid to ſucceed, was in uſe and force *long before*

" the other ceaſed *." *Excellent logician and chronologer!* I hope the D. D. had not his *diploma* for his ſkill in chronology, unleſs he calls three years, *many*. From the beginning of John's miniſtry to the death of Chriſt, at the greateſt extent was but *five years*, and from that of the Apoſtles but *three: Long before, many years indeed!* But doth the Dr. think, that the multitudes baptized by John were *Chriſtians*; or did John's Baptiſm initiate perſons and bring them into the church of Chriſt? I hope he is not *ſo weak* to think it, for how was it then, that *the number of the Diſciples and their names* (even after the aſcenſion of Chriſt) ſhould be only *about one hundred and twenty* †. But why doth *your champion* boaſt of *many*, or three years? As in ſome places he quotes *Maimonides*, we may hope, he hath read that writer, either in *Hebrew* or *Latin*; if he hath, that author and other cabaliſtical and talmudical writers (his favourite companions) inform him, that *Baptiſm* was adminiſtered *many centuries of years* before John Baptiſt was born; and that by this external rite, the Jews received their Proſelytes, *men, women and children*. How could the Doctor now, ſo artfully queſtion, " whe-" ther it can be ſaid to be the cuſtom of the Jewiſh " miniſters to baptize parents and their children;" yea he ſays, " ſurely, it cannot be ſaid ‡;" but his chief oracles, the *Jewiſh Rabbis*, tell him they did; and ſo have perſons infinitely better verſed in Hebrew antiquities, than he can pretend to; the mention of them as his opponents muſt certainly frighten him: Dr. Lightfoot, Dr. Whitby, the great Selden, Buxtorff, Grotius, &c. not to ſay his own great Apoſtle Dr. Gale ‖. The Gentiles were always conſidered and ſtiled by the Jews, *unclean*; and as waſhings were appointed under the law, as a means of purification from their own legal uncleanneſs, and they were told, *one ordinance, one law and one manner ſhall be for you and for the ſtranger that ſojourneth with you* §; no wonder they received them into their church by the puri-

* Sermon, p. 12. † Acts, i. 15.

‡ Sermon, pag. 15. Note.

‖ " It muſt be acknowledged that the Jews do generally aſſert " theſe things." Gale's Sermons, vol. ii. pag. 218.

§ Numb. xv. 15, 16.

fying

fying rite *Baptiſm*, as well as by *circumciſion*; and no *man of learning and honeſty* can deny, but that when the Gentile proſelytes of righteouſneſs, were received into the Jewiſh church, *all their children were incorporated with them*, and became of the houſhold of God. Now, Sir, as our Lord adopted this rite of waſhing, *or Baptiſm*, for initiating members into his church; is it not reaſonable to ſuppoſe, he would have it applied to the ſame ſubjects, *parents and their children*; as was the cuſtom of the Jews for centuries before? Or if he had intended to *exclude children*; would he not have given *a prohibition*, that his Apoſtles might not have acted according to the *common uſage* of the Jews, and the church of God in paſt ages; you muſt excuſe me, if I ſay, *he certainly would:* But did he in his great commiſſion to them, Matt. xxviii. 19? By no means, but moſt evidently included children; without demurring on the *antecedent*, and *relative*, and *diſagreement of gender*, in their commiſſion (like the Doctor, * which a mere novice in Greek knows are not uncommon) they could underſtand it no other way, than to *baptize the parents*, that through their preaching embraced the faith of Chriſt, and *all their children* with them; as was the uſage at that and in former times under a more rigorous diſpenſation, receiving parents and their children into the church of God, by baptiſm and circumciſion: Suppoſe our Lord, Sir, had not changed the rite, but ordered his Diſciples to *go, diſciple all nations, circumciſing them in the name of the Father*, &c. Would they not have thought themſelves directed, to *circumciſe the children* of Chriſtian proſelytes or believers, as well as the parents, if not *every male of the family?* But the *very words* of the Apoſtles commiſſion, include infants; and as they muſt have concluded themſelves ordered, to admit children with their parents into God's viſible church; had the word been *circumciſe*, inſtead of *baptize*; why ſhould not we ſuppoſe them directed, to *baptize children?* Eſpecially as the great deſign and end of the ordinances of circumciſion and baptiſm, *are the ſame*; the abſciſſion of fleſh *in one*, and the application of water *in the other*, both repreſent men's corruption and defilement, and the ne-

* Sermon, pag. 14.

ceſſity

ceſſity of their being cleanſed, and purified from fleſhly and ſinful principles; and the Doctor himſelf acknowledges, that one was the *initiating ordinance* into the church of God before Chriſt; and that *Baptiſm is appointed for the ſame end*, under the Goſpel diſpenſation; and yet *one doth not ſucceed another*. Pray adviſe him *to retract*, or be a *little more conſiſtent*; if he would but ſeriouſly and free of prejudice read Col. ii. 11, 12. he would *never more aſſert*, that Baptiſm came not in the room of circumciſion; but declare it to be a *groſs abſurdity*, to deny it did not: For the Apoſtle's argument, according to *common ſenſe*, is, that as Baptiſm repreſents and ſeals the ſame bleſſings, as did circumciſion, therefore it was needleſs for Chriſtians to be partakers of circumciſion, eſpecially as Chriſt's circumciſion had put an end to that ceremony, and they were baptiſed into him, and one with him. Well, *Sir*, ſince it is fully proved, that children were *always members* of God's viſible church; and received into it by *circumciſion*, and alſo *by baptiſm*, (if their parents were proſelyted Gentiles) ſince 'tis plain, the *Apoſtles commiſſion* included children; and their Lord did not order them to *deviate* from the practice of the church in the uſe of that rite, as to the ſubjects; ſince children were never *blotted out of the Covenant of God*, or rejected by Chriſt, as *improper ſubjects* of his church (of which there is not a ſhadow in all the ſacred records;) and ſince Baptiſm *moſt evidently* ſucceeds circumciſion, for as without the laſt, none could be members of the church of God, in former ages, ſo ſince Chriſt, who *aboliſhed circumciſion*, none can ſtand in a viſible relation to God, or be members of his church, but *by Baptiſm*, who dares forbid water to children, that they may be baptized, and ſo under *this gracious*, as well as under the *legal diſpenſation*, be a ſeed *viſibly*, and *actually devoted* to their Maker?

But, Sir, the text 1 Cor. vii. 14. if there were *no more* in the New Teſtament, is a ſufficient authority, for Miniſters to receive children into their Lord's church by Baptiſm; you muſt indulge me in ſaying, I never yet ſaw or heard any tolerable explanation of this paſſage given by any of your brethren; *elſe were your children unclean*,

unclean, but now they are holy. In what ſenſe were the children of believers, more holy than thoſe of Pagans? Surely, the *marriages of heathens* were as lawful as thoſe of chriſtians, and *their children* born in wedlock, as *legitimate*; what other diſtinction can there be, or could the Apoſtle mean, by unclean and holy; than that the children of infidel and idolatrous gentiles, ſtood in *no covenant relation* to Jehovah, and had *no right* to the privileges of his church; but the children of chriſtian parents, or if only one was a believer, the unbeliever was ſo far ſanctified to the believer's uſe, that the children proceeding from them, were *holy*; (not merely lawfully begotten, but) as the Jews were ſtiled an *holy nation*, ſo *they*, were not to be accounted as the *children of unclean Gentiles*, but were to be ſeparated from them, to be counted among the people of God, and ſet apart to him, by the *initiating ordinance and ſeal.* Suppoſe, Sir, it had been ſaid to the Jews, that though one parent ſhould be *unclean*, or a *Gentile*, yet if the other was a *Jew*, their children would be *holy*; would not every one among them, immediately have underſtood what was meant thereby; even that the children were peculiarly related to God, to be conſidered as the natural ſeed of Abraham *the ſame*, as if both parents were Jews; that hence they had a right to come into the congregation of the Lord, and they would accordingly have circumciſed them; 'tis evident, the *Apoſtle Paul* underſtood the Holy Ghoſt to mean this, and hence he took Timothy *in right of his mother*, and circumciſed him*. In connection with this text, I may cite another of the ſame purport, Rom. xi. 16, 17. It not only proves that the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Church is one and the ſame; and conſequently, the *members*, and the *privileges of the members* ſhould be the ſame; or at leaſt, not be *curtailed* under the goſpel diſpenſation; but, *demonſtrates* the right, that children of chriſtian parents, *the branches of the holy root*, have to admiſſion into the church of God: Surely if believing gentiles are grafted into the church of God, inſtead of the unbelieving Jews and their ſeed, who are broken off; their children ought to be grafted in with them; elſe the Jews *before Chriſt*, had a great privilege,

* Acts xvi. 1, 3.

which

which was *denyed* to them under the gospel dispensation, *though believers*, and to believing gentiles also; but the Apostle's stiling the *branches*, or *children*, *holy*, is a demonstration, that they stand in as *visible relation* to God as ever, and have a *right to the token* or pledge: And doth he not in the 24 ver. of the same chapter say, *that the natural branches, the Jews, shall again be grafted into their own olive tree, the church of God*; now think you, that their children will not be grafted, or entered with them? *doubtless they will.* Consider what the prophet says, with respect to this happy event: *Their children also shall be as aforetime, and their congregation shall be established before me, and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God* *. Now, Sir, if the children of *christians* are *as holy*, as those of the *Jews*; if they are declared *by inspiration* to be so, *standing in a peculiar visible relation to God*; and if the children of the Jews are to be grafted in again to the church together with their parents; what reasons can be assigned, why the children of believing gentiles, should not *by baptism*, be grafted in with their parents, to that church, which for *above* 4000 *years* always received and embraced them, and *never rejected them.* I cannot but cry out, *Oh Prejudice, Oh Bigotry, how blind are your votaries!*

You remember, the Doctor's paraphrase in his sermon on Luke xviii. 16. or Matt. xix. 14. (*which he pleases*) and how much that text grappled him; and that with all his torturing, he *could not*, and *cannot* but say, it clearly proves the Redeemer's *love* to infants, and his readiness to *receive and bless them.* And really, Sir, those whom he took up in his arms and *blessed*, or that are *capable* of divine blessing, I should be afraid to cast out of his church, and assert they have no right, to be received into it. You know I question'd whether *something within*, did not tell him, while he was wresting the words; that they proved, children were as *dear to God*, under the *christian*, as under the *Abrahamic*, and *Mosaic dispensations*, and that they were real members of the church of Christ: Our Lord's words are, *of such is the kingdom of Heaven*;

* Jer. xxx. 20. 22.

which

which you grant, ſignifies ſometimes the kingdom or church of Chriſt here, and in ſome places, the kingdom of glory above; the Doctor may take which ſenſe he pleaſes; if *the former*, they are expreſly declared by the great head of the Church himſelf, *real ſubjects of his kingdom among men*; if he prefers the *latter ſenſe*, they are ex confeſſo, partakers of the *beſt bleſſings* God can beſtow on the human race above; and if ſo; *pray*, why ſhould they be excluded from part and lot, with the bleſſed on earth; if members of the inviſible Church, why not of the viſible? I ſee *you laugh* at his reply, that "the kingdom of Heaven, cannot deſign the church of "Chriſt under the goſpel diſpenſation, becauſe 'tis not "national, but congregational, conſiſting of men*, "gathered out of the world by the grace of God, and "who make a public profeſſion of Chriſt; which in-"fants are not capable of, and ſo cannot be real ſub-"jects of it†."

You ſay, this deſerves no reply, *but pity* for the writer; but how happened it, Sir, that the *children of Jews and proſelyted Gentiles*, who were as incapable of making a public profeſſion of religion, as the *infant ſeed of chriſtians*; were *real ſubjects* of the Church of God? But leaving him to ſtudy this knotty queſtion, and bluſh for his quibble; you deſire me to take notice of his other reply, or *ſolution of the text*. I was almoſt in hopes, you would have overlooked this, for the Doctor's ſake; *for ſtrange!* though our Lord declares *totidem verbis*, *that of infants is the kingdom of Heaven*; he contrariwiſe affirms "in fact, they themſelves are not intended, only "ſuch as they, ſuch who are comparable to them for "meekneſs and humility, for freedom from malice, "pride and ambition‡." But I will rather believe *his maſter*, than him, or *any man* whatever; his *round and poſitive aſſertions*, will go but a little way, eſpecially when

* *Men gathered*, why had he not ſaid women alſo: Surely women ought not to be excluded from the church of God, though by his expreſſion he rejects them, as well as children. Read Gal. iii, 28. † Serm. p. 14. note. ‡ Ibid.

ſcripture is directly againſt him; according to his explanation and view of Chriſt's words and conduct; had *ſheep*, *lambs*, or *doves* been brought to him, he might have been *angry with his diſciples*, for forbidding the bearers to come near and preſent them; and have not only ſaid, *ſuffer them to be brought*, but have alſo *taken them into his arms*, *laid his hands upon them*, and *bleſſed them*, and then pronounced, *that of ſuch as they*, (who are comparable to them for temper, meekneſs, &c.) is the kingdom of Heaven: Riſum teneatis amice! yourſelf declare, (according to a learned friend's obſervation *) that there is *no juſt connection*, between Chriſt's diſpleaſure at his diſciples, for keeping Infants from him; and his giving as the reaſon of it, that *not to them*, but, to grown perſons *quite different ſubjects*, his kingdom belonged. Had our Lord's intention and reaſon, been what Dr. Gill hath aſſerted, he certainly might as well have taken ſheep, &c. into his arms as the Children; but indeed, Sir, his embracing Infants in his arms, and bleſſing them; his exhorting his diſciples *to take heed not to deſpiſe ſuch little ones*, *not one of them*, declaring that they have Angels to attend them †; and that of ſuch is the kingdom of Heaven, they are part of his church and kingdom; fully prove that they are *beloved of God*, *members of his viſible Church*, *and ought to be eſteemed*, *and treated as ſuch*, *by all his miniſters* ‡.

Here I would beg you, to give the Doctor ſome friendly, and *neceſſary advice*: If he publiſhes another edition of his ſermon, or *any thing more on the ſubject*; caution him, for *decency's ſake*, to give the *apoſtles of Chriſt* a little better character, if he doth not me; he ſays "theſe "children might be diſeaſed, and ſo brought to Chriſt

* Towgood. † Matt. xviii. 2, 10. compared with Mark ix. 36.

‡ Even Dr. Gale oppoſes Dr. Gill on this text; he confeſſes, that Chriſt did *in fact* intend *the infants themſelves*, and not ſuch as they; and draws an argument from thence to ſilence parents fears concerning their childrens ſafety and happineſs, ſhould they die unbaptized. Gale's Serm. V. 2. p. 179.

"to

" to be cured of their diſeaſes *." If this was really the caſe, what *monſters* muſt the Apoſtles be, to reject, and endeavor to put them and their tender mothers away, when they knew a *touch* of their maſter's hand, yea a *word* from his lips, would have cured them, and *preſerved their lives*. Knowing a little what parental affection is, I cannot but think, *he is deſtitute of it*, or bigotry forces him to ſay and unſay juſt to ſerve his own turn: But his character of the Apoſtles, is not to be wondered at, ſince he plainly cenſures the wiſdom, and goodneſs, and moral government of God his maker; aſſerting, that children *ought not* to be admitted into the viſible Church, till it appears they are of the inviſible †. But, why did God *command them* to be admitted of old, and *continued them* in his viſible Church, thouſands of years? Why did not *Adam*, *Noah*, *Abraham*, *Moſes*, the *Prophets* and *Jewiſh Prieſts* argue, as Dr. Gill; and of their own head, *without divine authority*, exclude them? Truly, Sir, becauſe they *modeſtly* reflected, that God excelled them in wiſdom, and well knew who were the moſt proper ſubjects of his own Church; and they had likewiſe *clearer views* of his grace to their Children, and were *more grateful* for it. The Doctor himſelf acknowledges the neceſſity of Infants being regenerated, before they can enter the kingdom of glory; muſt he not then either *damn all* that die in childhood; or maintain that ſome are born again of the ſpirit: And if *of the ſpirit*, why not *of water?* if they are ſanctifyed, by the Holy Ghoſt's being ſhed εξεχεεν *poured out* upon them; why ſhould not water, which is but the emblem, be alſo *poured out upon them in Baptiſm?*

Again, Sir, doth not Acts ii. 39. connected with Gal. iii. 7, 16, 17 and 29. *fully authorize* the miniſters of Chriſt, to receive children into his viſible Church; which can *only be done*, by Baptiſm. All who are believers in Chriſt, are *Abraham's ſeed, and heirs according to the promiſe*; and as the covenant of God with Abraham, is of grace, and *in full force*; ſo the promiſe and bleſſings contained in it abide, and extend by *ſcripture au-*

* Serm. p. 13. † Ib. p. 14. note.

thority, not merely to them that believe, but to their children; *the promiſe is to you, and to your Children*; not to your Children, when *grown up to adult years*, and capable of making a public profeſſion of their faith; for what advantage then had the *Jew* or the *Gentile believer, of old*; or what advantage hath the *Chriſtian* now, *either parent or child*, above the *Ethiopian*, or the *Indian Savage?* The Apoſtle's meaning *muſt be*; the promiſe is to you, and to your Children in their *infantile ſtate*; they have a right, to all the grants and privileges of the gracious covenant, God made with Abraham; and as his Children received the *appointed token* and ſign of it, ſo your ſeed are to be *baptized with water*, which is the *chriſtian circumciſion*, the appointed token and ſeal *under the goſpel*, and become *viſible members* of Chriſt's Church: You will bear with me, if I add; that the expoſition which the Doctor and others of your brethren, give of thoſe paſſages, *hardly agrees with common ſenſe*; they too much ſatisfy themſelves, with ſaying, "that the ſenſe is "not that the Pædobaptiſts give;" and yet they will not give us a better, *one more natural and juſt.*

You join with the Doctor, in opinion, "that if In-"fants are real ſubjects of the church, they muſt have "an equal right to the Lord's ſupper as to Baptiſm, of "which they are equally capable*." *Far from it, Sir:* Your champion will inform you, that one ordinance *initiates* into the Church; and the other *eſtabliſhes*; was not Simon Magus a *real ſubject* of the Church, and yet I believe *Dr. Gill* would not chuſe to ſay, he had an *equal right* to the Lord's ſupper as to Baptiſm; but Children are not ſo much excluded from the ſupper, for *want of a right to it*, Sir, as for want of a *proper capacity* for it; which cannot be juſtly ſaid of them with reſpect to Baptiſm. In Baptiſm, the ſubjects are to be wholly paſſive, if the ſcripture Baptiſms under the law, (ſprinkling water and blood, &c. upon the prieſts, the people, the book of the law, utenſils of the tabernacle, &c.) are to be our precedents; and I could almoſt appeal to yourſelf, whether the *natural idea*, which the word *Bap-*

* Serm. p. 14. note.

tiſm

tism conveys, is not *passive*; that of water's being *applied to the body*, and not the body's being applied, or plunged into the water; but in the supper, the *word of God* requires those who partake of it, to be *active*; they must be of years sufficient, to examine themselves respecting their knowledge, faith, love, repentance and other *spiritual things*; they are not only to *take* the elements, and *eat*, and *drink*, but must be capable also, of *discerning the Lord's body*, of *understanding* the meaning of the christian symbols, and in the *exercise of christian graces receive them.*

You say, " the Doctor hath proved, that faith and " repentance are scripture prerequisites to Baptism, and " that on this the controversy hinges." *Doth it so?* Then if *any candor* is left, if the *mind is open to conviction*, the controversy must soon be at an end: I know the Doctor insisted much in his preaching, as he hath in his printed sermon *, on the *order of words* in scripture; the Apostles commission, was go, teach, and having *first taught*, then *baptize them*; so *repent* and be baptized, and he that *believeth* and is baptized; and again, the Corinthians *hearing*, *believed*, and were baptized. Alas, Sir, what a pity it is, such stress should be laid on the *placing of words* †, especially by *Dr. Gill*, who ought to have been the *last man in the universe*, to have done it; I have already been obliged to set *John* against *Gill*, now I am forced to set *Gill* against *John*. Hear what he says, " The Apostle " Paul in recounting the several blessings of divine grace " Rom. viii. 30. places vocation before justification, as " something antecedent to it, from whence it is con- " cluded that vocation is in order of time before justifi- " cation: to which I reply; *that the order of things is* " *frequently inverted in scripture.* The Jews have a saying " that there is neither first nor last in the law, i. e. it doth " not always observe *to put that first, which is first*; and " *that last which is last, but frequently changes the order*; " *so that strictly, nothing is to be concluded from thence.* " And as this is obvious in the law, and in the other

* P. 19, 20. † 'Tis said Mark i. 4. that John baptised and preached.

" writings

" writings of the Old Teſtament, ſo it is, *in the books of* " *the New Teſtament*; where it is eaſy to obſerve, that " the order of the three perſons in the Trinity, is not " always kept to *;" with other inſtances he adds. You ſee, Sir, *he is cruſhed* under the weight of his own arguments; *John Gill* ſays, *the order of things is frequently inverted and changed in ſcripture, both in the Old and New Teſtament; ſo that nothing ſtrictly is to be concluded from thence:* And yet, *the order of words*, is *Goliah's ſword, ſpear, helmet*, and *coat of mail*, when he marches forth for *adult Baptiſm*. Here I might give over, *for the mighty man is fallen*; *his own words* have taken hold upon him; and he certainly *is not able to look up*; but as you exhort me *to be merciful*; and to conſider, that *more eminent, conſiſtent*, and *learned men*, than he, have objected " that faith and repentance " are ſcripture qualifications for Baptiſm;" and think yourſelf, " that children ought not to be baptized, be- " cauſe not capable of believing," I will lift the Doctor up, and return him his ſword, " Infants are not capable " of believing and repenting, and therefore not to be " baptized, or admitted into the church of God." But ſurely, they are as *capable of thoſe things*, and *as worthy* to be members of the viſible church, as the *Iſraelite infants*; who *nevertheleſs*, were commanded to be *circumciſed*; and ſo *became debtors to do the whole law of God*; and why therefore, ſhould not *children of Chriſtian parents be baptized*, and ſo *become debtors*, or be laid under ſtrong obligations, and *early engagements*, to obey the precepts of him *into whoſe holy name* they are baptized †: If the Doctor ſtill objects, " they are not capa- " ble of making a public profeſſion of their faith at bap- " tiſm:" Truly, Sir, *as good*, and *as long an one*, as the *Reverend Mr. Carmichael* did at his; which you well remember, was only a long and deep, *Oh!* You retort, " What " uſe is baptiſm of to children, what benefits do they " receive by it?" But may not I aſk in return, of what uſe was circumciſion to Iſhmael and Eſau, and to the Jewiſh

* Gill's doctrine of Juſtification. p. 70.

† That children may be brought under religious, as well as civil obligations by their parents, the word of God abundantly declares.

chil-

children; and what benefits did they receive? Yea of what use or benefit was Baptism to multitudes baptized by John in Jordan and at Enon; or to Simon Magus, and to numbers of those, who have renounced their infant Baptism, and been dipped by Dr. Gill and others, at adult years? But *notwithstanding* many who are baptized, are never the better for it; yet, God will have a *visible church* in the world, and his visible seal is to be set upon them, whom he prescribes; he hath declared, *children* to stand in a covenant relation to him, and always *treated them as such*; it is not *for men* then, *to discriminate*, and *be wiser than God*; and as I would sooner baptize a child, on the *Covenant and promise of God*, and the *parent's faith*, then an adult person (who may deceive me) on his *verbal profession*; so as the bounties of providence are sanctified to our use, by prayer and thanksgiving, I doubt not, the *ordinance of Baptism* is frequently *sanctified* to the subject, as well as other *divine institutions*, to them that attend upon them. But should no real benefit redound to the infant baptized, any more than to the adult person; yet should it be taken away by death, before years of discretion; parents have this to comfort them; that *by Baptism* they devoted them to God, and he visibly received them into his church; the seal of his gracious covenant and of spiritual blessings was set upon them, and therefore justly conclude, that he is a God in covenant to them, that *because he loved the fathers, therefore he chose their seed* *; and hath taken them *as his heirs*, to dwell with himself for ever, and possess an incorruptible inheritance. I confess, Sir, it surprizes me, to hear you object against infants Baptism, for their *want of faith*, *repentance*, and *incapacity* of receiving any benefit by it; *benefit they have*, and may receive; you acknowledge they *must have grace*, if they ever inherit glory; and have not you and the Doctor, read in the *New Testament*, of one who was baptized, *without faith*, and *without repentance*; and who was *more incapable* of receiving *moral benefits by Baptism*, than Dr. Gill can pretend infants are; I was going to cry out, *Behold, Sir, for your joy*; but I had forgot; how-

* Deut. iv. 37.

ever,

ever, you will suffer me to speak to myself and others; *Behold all ye Christian parents, for your comfort and establishment in this matter, this instance is no other then Jesus the great head of the church!* You doubtless are convinced, Sir; but I hear the Doctor saying, "I will not, unless "one come from the dead," or "unless you show me "express commands for infant Baptism." Why, what are *all the texts and proofs I have produced*; but so many *express commands and warrants*; *more express*, than any he can show me, for *not keeping the Jewish sabbath*, but the first day of the week; or for not *abstaining from blood and things strangled*; or for *admitting women to the Lord's Supper*; or for his *manner of plunging them into the water*; or *for refusing to admit children into God's visible church*; or *for casting them out:* I have showed him *many*, and can show him *many more express commands*, for receiving them into the church of God, by the appointed *initiating seal*; let him, or any other person, *show me but one text*, where God blotted them out of his covenant; or Christ rejected them as improper subjects of his church and kingdom; or where either refused to acknowledge them as theirs; I will lay my hand upon my mouth, and my mouth in the dust, and *the next week*, beg the Doctor to *baptize me*, either by *sprinkling*, or *dipping*, which he pleases *.

But, I find *scripture precepts* will not satisfy Dr. Gill; he objects there is *no scripture precedent:* "I defy the "whole world to give one single precedent †:" *of what?* The *Old Testament*, and his *rabbinical writers* also, will give him a thousand precedents, of children's being received into the church of God; "Aye, but where is "one precedent of infant Baptism?" Why if children of Gentile Proselytes were received into the Church of God, under the Mosaic dispensation, as *it is certain* they were; it was *by Baptism*, as well as *by circumcision*; and as the Gospel of grace, that broke down the partition wall between Jews and Gentiles, and made both one; cannot be supposed, *(without great scandal to it)* to have cut off children from the covenant and church of God;

* Provided it be summer. † Serm. page 17.

there

there was *no other way* of receiving them into it, (by the Apoſtles and firſt preachers of Chriſt) but by Baptiſm: But how, Sir, could the Doctor ſo far forget himſelf, and act ſo *groſsly inconſiſtent*; as to affirm there was no precedent for infant Baptiſm in the word of God, and what is *ſtill worſe*, with ſo much aſſurance, *defy the whole world to give a ſingle precedent*; and within a few pages of his defiance, he gives *one himſelf:* "The Iſraelites were "baptized in the cloud and in the ſea, and with great "propriety may it be called a Baptiſm, as that is, by im-"merſion *." A more unfortunate inſtance for immerſion, I proved he could not have produced †; but pray, Sir, be *ingenuous*; were not the *children* of the Iſraelites, *baptized at this time*, as well as the *parents*; or was there *another miracle* wrought to prevent it? You cry, *forgetful inconſiſtent Doctor!* Come, this is *one ſcripture inſtance*, or *precedent*; and notwithſtanding your *ſkilful advocate*'s judicious reaſonings upon them; I believe the *houſholds baptized* by St. Paul, will produce *ſome more*; at leaſt *will prove*, that the Apoſtles acted, as the Jews did under the law; as the *faith of the parents*, or head, entitled the *children* and *houſhold* to circumciſion, ſo likewiſe *to baptiſm*, and *they had it*.

You remember, how the Doctor in preaching, complained of the *unfairneſs* of the Pædobaptiſts; in putting him and his brethren, to prove there were no children in the ſcripture houſholds; and at laſt, how he vaunted, that *he was capable of proving this negative* ‡. I liſtened with great attention for the *proofs*, but heard none, but *bare aſſertion:* As to the jailor's family indeed, I obſerved to you, he proved there were no children there, becauſe it is ſaid, *he believed in God with all his houſe:* He hath now added, "He that can find any other in his houſe, be-"ſides all that were in it, muſt be reckoned a very ſa-"gacious perſon §." You muſt, Sir, reply with me;

* Sermon, page 26. † Letter IV. page 26.

‡ Sermon, page 16. But ſuppoſe he could have proved there were no children in the houſholds; it is moſt evident from ſcripture, had there been any, they would have been baptized.

§ Sermon, page 17.

that *John Gill himself is that very sagacious person:* Should you, or any other person, not just of *his supra size*, say, that *Christ died for all men* *; *tasted death for every man* †; *gave himself a ransom for all* ‡; and that, *God would have all men to be saved* §, &c. he would certainly with a *feverish fervor of spirit*, affirm, that *all* in these passages, and that emphatical phrase *every man*, did not mean or include *all*, but *strenuously insist* on it, that there were *thousands* if not *millions excepted.* Tell *Doctor sagacious*, to remember his darling axiom, "*what proves too much, proves no-*"*thing:*" Is it not easier to reconcile the *phraseology*, with the jailors having children in his house; than it is, Sir, to suppose, that *every individual* in it, should have *new hearts*, *penitent spirits*, and *saving faith*, in the *same nick of time*, to be *baptized all together at midnight?* Truly it is, and the Doctor's argument is so weak, that for once I will help him to a much better, borrowed from one of his brethren: "It may very much be "questioned, whether the jailor had any children, seeing "it hath been observed, that for many years together, "not one child was born to all the jail-keepers in all "the county of Essex." This is *demonstration!* but query; if every jailor had a *river*, or *large pond* in his house? Else, the instance of the *scripture jailor* and his families, being *baptized straightway*, *in the same hour of the night*; will quite demolish *your dipping fabric.* But was the same enquiry also made into *every Lydia's family* through the county? Suppose none of them had any children; what proof is that, there were none in the *scripture Lydias?* It is a pity, Dr. Gill had not followed the example of his *ingenuous* and *warm* predecessor Dr. Gale; who after saying "it is easy to shew; that "*all those* who were baptized in the scripture families, "heard the word preached, believed in Christ, rejoiced, "and received the Holy Ghost ‖," mentioned Crispus, the Corinthians, and the jailor; but *fairly omitted* Lydia and her household; he wisely judged, if he produced it, it would make his *hearers stare*, if not *con-*

* 2 Cor. v. 14. † Heb. ii. 9. ‡ 1 Tim. ii. 6.
§ Verse 4. ‖ Gale's Sermon, Vol. 2. page 180.

found

found him; the word of God ſaith, *The Lord opened her heart, and ſhe was baptized and her houſhold:* Infidels muſt from this text, ſee ſhe had *no children* under her roof, and that *every one* of the family, *heard the word preached, believed in Chriſt*, &c. &c. and were *baptized on their own profeſſion of faith!* This is a *juſt concluſion* without doubt; worthy of *Dr.* Gill, as well as *Dr. Gale*; but the beſt excuſe for them, I think, is that they have not read the paſſage: There is not *a word in ſcripture*, of any of Lydia's houſhold believing, or their *ſo much as attending*, to the words of the Apoſtles, but of *hers only*; and yet when *ſhe believed*, we are told *Baptiſm was adminiſtered to her, and her houſhold*; after the ſame manner, you ſee, as the *former ſeal* was applied to *Abraham*, and the *Jewiſh houſholds*. Dr. Gill hath indeed in his printed Sermon *, aſſerted, "That thoſe in Lydia's houſe were "brethren, whom afterwards the Apoſtles went to ſee, "and whom they comforted, and ſo not infants." But he hath not referred us *to the text* for this; doubtleſs for fear of being detected; but, Sir, if you will turn to Acts xvi. 40. you will ſoon diſcover, either your champions *honeſty*, or *judgment*, as well as his reſolution; *And they went out of the priſon, and entered into the houſe of Lydia: And when they had ſeen the brethren, they comforted them, and departed.* What can be plainer, than that the brethren, were the *Chriſtian believers of the city*, and not Lydia's natural brethren; beſides is it not a little wonderful, that there ſhould be ſeveral brethren grown up to men, living in one houſe, and a *ſiſter* be the maſter of the houſhold? His reaſoning concerning the *houſhold of Stephanas, you confeſs* is futile, and ſuffer me to add, *beneath a ſchool boy.*

Thus, Sir, I have freely given you, ſome of the many reaſons of my faith and practice, *reſpecting Baptiſm*; why I preſent my own children to God in that ordinance; and why I *Baptize* thoſe of chriſtian parents: Was I writing profeſſedly to *Pædo Baptiſts*; many more things might be offered, that would greatly tend to *relieve, and ſtrengthen their minds* on this ſubject. You ſee

* Page 16.

we have all the *reaſonable proof* in the world; that as Chriſt accepted the faith of parents, and for it healed and bleſſed many of their children; ſo his Apoſtles *baptized whole houſholds on the faith of the parents*. If the faith, and profeſſion of Jews and *gentile proſelites* entitled *all their children* to part and lot, in the church and heritage of God under the *moſaic diſpenſation*; why ſhould not the ſame privilege and right, appertain to the *children of believers in Chriſt*; and if they received *natural benefit* from Chriſt, in having their maladies cured, *on account* of the faith of their parents; why may we not ſuppoſe, *they did, may*, and *do receive* at times, *ſpiritual benefit and bleſſings*, on the ſame account: Really, Sir, to ſuppoſe the contrary, would be to ſay, *God is more inclined to*, and *delights rather in juſtice, than in mercy*; that they have ſuffered, and do ſuffer, on account of *their firſt parents diſobedience*, is undeniable; and *many inſtances* might be produced from ſacred and profane hiſtory, of childrens ſuffering through, or being involved in the guilt and puniſhment of their parents evil deeds*; and why ſhould they not be conſidered on the other hand as *parts of pious parents*, and from their relation to them, be *diſtinguiſhed*, and *bleſſed of God and of men*, under the *Chriſtian*, as well as the *legal diſpenſation?*

You ſee, Sir, *we have ſcripture authority*, and *precedents enough*, for *admitting children into Gods viſible church*; and for *conſidering and treating them as his property*, and *the members of Chriſt's kingdom*; as Dr. Gill was ſo full of his *defy's*; you remember, I defy'd him, *to produce one ſcripture warrant, or precedent, for refuſing children the ſeal and token of God's covenant with his profeſſing people*, (which they enjoyed near 2000 years,) or *for excluding them the Church of God:* You likewiſe remember, he provoked me to defy him, *to produce one ſcripture precept, or precedent for delaying the Baptiſm of children of chriſtian parents, till grown up*; or, *for baptizing adult perſons born of ſuch parents*, (which are his ſubjects of Baptiſm.) But behold his

* Dr. Gill would do well to conſider Gen. xvii. 14. Exod. xx. 5. 1 Kings xi. 12, 13. 2 Chron. xxx. 9. Jer. xlix. 11. Pſ. xxxvii. 25. &c.

Sermon

Sermon and notes; *my defiances are in full force*; he hath not been able to produce *any warrant or precedent*, to turn againſt me, or to *defend himſelf*. He thinks it indeed, "unreaſonable to expect and require Scripture precedents "of the Baptiſm of adult perſons, born of Chriſtian "parents *;" yet you know, a *mere novice in chronology* would not think it ſo, on the ſame account that he doth; "ſuch inſtances would require length of time, a courſe "of years." But the *ſame oracle* that ſo boldly aſſerted before him, "it hath been often and fully proved to de- "monſtration, that the word *baptize* ſignifies *only* to dip "into the water †;" informs him alſo, "that ſome of "the children of the firſt converts were at the time of "the Apoſtles writing his Epiſtle to the Romans, which "was a *conſiderable time* after the firſt foundation, even "*fifteen years*, members of that church ‡:" Now as one of his moſt zealous brethren, thought *fifteen years*, ſufficient for children to grow up and be baptized, and received into the church; ſurely *ſixty years after Chriſt*, which you know is the compaſs of the *new teſtament hiſtory*, muſt be a *length of time*, and *courſe of years*, ſufficient to furniſh *many precedents* of ſuch perſons, had that been the *Scripture practice*.

As the Doctor hath not pleaded *antiquity* in his favor in his printed ſermon, we may conclude, he is at length convinced 'tis againſt him; though in a late publication (which I cannot at preſent animadvert on) he hath declared *infant Baptiſm*, to be a *Popiſh invention and foolery*: What doth this manifeſt, Sir? it ſhews——but I ſpare him: He muſt be an *ignoramus* in chronology and eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, that thus aſſerts; for who knows not, that the *firſt Pope*, or *univerſal Biſhop*, was *Boniface* III. in the ſeventh century *Anno* 606 ‖; and the Doctor himſelf muſt know, if not from his own learning and reading, yet from the *references* of his opponents; that *Auguſtin* in the *fourth century* maintained that the Chriſ-

* Sermon, pag. 17. Note. † Dr. Gale's Sermons, vol. ii. pag. 144. ‡ Ibid. pag. 203.

‖ The title *Papa* was not peculiar to the Biſhops of Rome, but was given to all Biſhops in the firſt centuries of the church; We frequently meet with Papa or Pope Cyprian, &c.: in Boniface the third, the *Papacy* begun.

tian

tian church had always held and *always practiſed infant Baptiſm:* And in another place, ſays, "that infants "are to be baptized, is the authority of the univerſal "church, without all doubt delivered *by Chriſt and his Apoſ-* "*tles.*" And his cotemporary Pelagius, whoſe intereſt it was, to have denied and objected againſt his opponents, the *non practice* of infant Baptiſm, by the Apoſtles and primitive church, declares himſelf, "to be defamed and "ſlandered by ſome, in their reporting him, as denying "the ſacrament of Baptiſm to infants," and adds, "*that he never heard, no not of an impious heretic, who would* "*ſay this concerning infants.*" And 'tis very remarkable, Sir, that in all the liſt, of what are ſtiled *heretics* and *hereſy*'s, from the Apoſtles time to the eleventh century, you meet with *none* that deny infant Baptiſm *: But not only in the *fourth*, in the *third century* alſo, there are proofs of it; *Cyprian*, and a *council of ſixty ſix Biſhops, and Origen*, wrote of, and *practiſed infant Baptiſm:* Yea, in the *ſecond century*, *Clemens Romanus*, and *Irenæus* were like minded, and *Juſtin Martyr*, alſo, who lived within *forty years* of the Apoſtles. Inſtead of infant Baptiſm being a *Popiſh invention*, and one of their relicks, adored by Proteſtants; an oppoſition to, and the denial of it, is rather to be attributed to *Popiſh corruptions and errors: Tertullian*, whom your champion hath ſo much gloried in, would have the Baptiſm of infants and others, even grown perſons, delayed for fear of their afterwards falling into ſin; but inſtead of denying infant Baptiſm he fully proves 'twas the practice of the church in his time *(the ſecond century)* and inſiſts on its being performed by ſprinkling, in caſes of neceſſity even by *lay perſons:* His notion was, that Baptiſm waſhed away ſin. This tenet was adopted afterward by the *Romiſh church*, and I really believe, firſt led ſome in the *eleventh century*, to object againſt infant Baptiſm; you ſee, your *great* Dr. *Gale* ſtrenuouſly urges this notion, "one uſe and end and deſign of Baptiſm, was "for the remiſſion of ſins †. It certainly doth conduce

* We read indeed of Hemerobaptiſts, who every day unleſs they were baptized, did not eat; nay, and unleſs they cleanſed with water their beds and tables or platters, and cups and ſeats, would not make any uſe of them. Clem. Apoſt. Conſt. Lib. 6. ſect. 6.

† Gale's Sermon, vol. ii, pag. 193.

"to

" to the purging and purifying us from, and the remiſſion " and waſhing away of all the ſins we have committed *. " Unleſs they are ſo waſhed away by Baptiſm, they will " remain upon us unremitted †; theſe are *his very words*, and a truly Popiſh tenet; and could I believe it with all my heart, I muſt be myſelf an advocate for Antipædobaptiſm (unleſs in caſes of neceſſity). I ſhould not only refuſe Baptiſm, to all till they were *adult*, but put off *my own Baptiſm* to the laſt hour of life, and adviſe *every friend* to do the ſame; for then we ſhould be, *poſitively ſure of the remiſſion of our ſins*, and *of ſalvation*.

To this *fatal error*, which the church of Rome hath eſtabliſhed by laws and canons; I cannot but attribute the *riſe of your ſect*: But whatever was the cauſe, tell Dr. *Gill*, it greatly concerns him to produce a *body of Chriſtians* before the *eleventh*, or any *writer of note*, before the *ſixteenth century*, who were againſt baptiſing the infants of Chriſtian parents, and for limiting that ordinance to adult perſons: 'Tis certainly, *a juſt concluſion*, that if any are to be charged with *innovations*, and *human inventions*, *and with acting without ſcripture warrant or precedent*, 'tis Dr. Gill in denying children the appointed token and ſeal of God's covenant with, and favor to them, and in his excluding them the viſible church. If they were ſtruck out of the Covenant, and caſt out of the church of God; 'tis not *unreaſonable* (as they were four thouſand years in it) to demand ſome proof *when*, if not a clear reaſon or two *why*: 'Till then, I know not how you can help concluding with me, that God, is a *God in Covenant with the children of Chriſtians*, as he was with thoſe of the *Patriarchs and Jews*; and therefore, *his ſeal of Baptiſm might, ought, and ſhould be applied to them*.

I intended to have ſummed up the number, and ſet before you the force of the ſeveral arguments, advanced in this and my former letters; but that I may not be tedious, ſhall reſerve this for another epiſtle; till when am,

Yours, &c.

* Ibid. pag. 194. † Ibid. pag. 199.

LETTER VI.

Recapitulates the chief Arguments againſt Dr. Gill, and concludes with wholeſome advice to him.

SIR,

I Beg leave to offer you *one letter* more, on the ſubject of Baptiſm, which according to my promiſe, ſhall be as brief as poſſible; not to reinforce what hath been advanced againſt *Dr. Gill*, with any auxiliaries *(though there are many troops at command)* I ſhall only recapitulate by way of queſtion, ſome of the chief arguments, I have uſed in defence of my own belief and practice.

Have I not as much right to fall out with a man and vilify him, becauſe his face is not like mine; as becauſe his religious opinions and judgment, are different from mine?

If I cannot reach the ſame ſtandard as another, or if I differ with a Chriſtian brother in a few indifferent things; why ſhould we not agree to differ, and yet love, communicate with, and behave towards each other as brethren?

Why ſhould a man inſiſt on the right of private judgment for himſelf, and refuſe it to others; or for their uſing it, cenſure and treat them, as fools, unlearned, ignorant of the ſcriptures, and unclean?

Is it reaſonable, for a man to complain of having what he hath done, and is conſtantly doing to others, returned unto him again; or ſhall the illiberal, uncharitable, paſſionate man, complain of being gently reproved?

Is that man a pertinent judicious preacher, whoſe diſcourſe hath not the leaſt reference to, connection with, or foundation in his text?

How could the Apoſtle not mean, or include the moral law in Dr. Gill's text; and yet rather deſign the chief branches and ſum of it?

Why ſhould the Holy Ghoſt, and Dr. Gill's characters of the moral law, be ſo widely different; or why ſhould the moral law be ſtiled a fiery law, grievous, the miniſtration of condemnation and death, &c. and yet the ſum of it, love to God and our neighbour not deſerve, or be diſtinguiſhed with the ſame epithets?

What ſort of an embaſſador muſt he be, who repreſents his ſovereign as a tyrant and an Egyptian taſk-maſter; when the firſt words of his inſtructions, and all his own experience from the hour of his birth, prove him gracious and merciful?

What muſt Chriſtians think of the ſervant that endeavours to ſet aſide, what his maſter came to eſtabliſh and perfect; Or that would perſuade men they are not bound to obey, what his Lord hath ſtrictly enjoined him and them, to fulfill to a tittle.

What reaſon can be given, or Scripture produced, for a miniſter's exalting poſitive inſtitutions, and external rites, above moral precepts?

Is it not an odd way of inſtructing men in righteouſneſs, and building them up in holineſs, to tell them they are not under the law, and the Goſpel hath no commands, but is all promiſes?

What authority is there to ſay men are juſtified and pardoned, when they continue in unbelief, and their actions prove them children of diſobedience and of wrath?

If an ungodly perſon, as ſuch, is juſtified and abſolved; how can the divine perfections be vindicated, and the word of God be true?

How can a being that never ſinned, yea, how can a non-entity, be charged with guilt or pardoned?

If men are juſtified pardoned and freed from puniſhment from eternity, how can they be juſtified by and through faith; or what occaſion is there for preaching, and other divine inſtitutions, or what need have men to fear ſin, and abſtain from it?

If the purpoſe of God juſtifies men from eternity, why doth it not glorify them alſo; or why ſhould not the world be created from eternity?

If Chriſt's commands are not grievous, and dipping in cold countries, is grievous, tending to endanger the chaſtity, health, and even life of his miniſters and people; how can dipping be Chriſt's command?

Can we ſuppoſe the compaſſionate Jeſus inſtituted an ordinance for his Diſciples ſtrict obſervance, of which many through weak and infirm conſtitutions, &c. &c. cannot ſafely partake, and by which many have been injured, (if not fallen into their long ſleep?)

As iron conſtitutions, brawny arms, and great ſtrength of body, would be neceſſary, if dipping was the only lawful mode of Baptiſm; ſhould not our Lord or his Apoſtles have given ſome rules, for the choice of ſuch perſons to miniſter in the church?

If waſhing the whole body, is neceſſary to Baptiſm, why is not the body naked; or if the naked head and ſhoulders are ſufficient, why not the face, the chief part of man?

Why ſhould circumciſion which affected but one part of the body, be ſufficient and acceptable to God, and Baptiſm the ſeal that ſucceeded it, be the reverſe, unleſs the whole body, or rather the naked face and garments are affected?

Is that man conſiſtent, who cenſures Papiſts for baptizing bells, &c. and yet divides the church and members of Chriſt about baptizing cloaths?

What greater virtue and efficacy, is there in a large, than in a ſmall quantity of water's being applied to the baptized; are they the holier that have the moſt, or doth the more water, naturally make the baptized more fiery and zealous?

Why

Why ſhould men make alterations in, and deviate from one poſitive and ſolemn ordinance, more than another?

Why ſhould the leaſt quantity of bread and wine be ſufficient and effectual in the Lord's Supper, but a large pool of water or a River be eſſential to Baptiſm?

How can any man maintain that βαπτιζω ſignifies only to dip, when all the learned, and the word of God, tell him it alſo ſignifies to waſh, to pour water upon, and to ſprinkle?

Why ſhould men inſiſt, on the Iſraelites being baptized in the cloud and in the ſea as a proof of Baptiſm by immerſion, when the Egyptians were the perſons immerſed in the ſea, and the Iſraelites were only ſprinkled from the cloud, and with the ſpray of the waves as they paſſed through the channel on dry ground?

Were the Apoſtles baptized with *wind*, or with *ſound*, as of wind; or really with the Holy Ghoſt?

If it is thought ſufficient to have the ſpirit poured out, and the blood of Chriſt ſprinkled, upon us, for the purification of the conſcience and ſalvation of the ſoul; why is not the ſprinkling of water in Baptiſm ſufficient for the body, without being dipped all over?

Why ſhould the Scriptures declare the ſeveral ſprinklings under the law, were Baptiſms; or ſtile thoſe perſons baptized, whoſe hands only were waſhed, if the whole body's being dipped, was eſſential to Baptiſm; or how could our Lord tell his Apoſtles that they were as clean, when their feet only were waſhed, as if their whole body had been ſo?

Why ſhould men lay ſuch ſtreſs on going into the water, and coming out of it, when the Greek words εις and εκ as properly ſignify to, and from, and eſpecially when it forces them to find caves in mountains, and in men's bodies for Chriſt to go into?

What greater repreſentation of a burial is there, in a man's going voluntarily into the water, and then joining with another, to put the other half of his body under water, for a moment or two, than in water being poured on him; or when a dead body is buried, is it by earth being poured in upon it, or like adult dipping; or are all that are dipped, actually buried with Chriſt?

If Scripture alluſions are to have any weight, why ſhould one that is forced, be preferred to three natural and obvious ones.

Is it reaſonable to ſuppoſe the Eunuch was dipt all over in the midſt of his journey; or the jailor and his houſhold, who were baptized at midnight; or the three thouſand men and women that were baptized in Jeruſalem, who muſt then go home through the ſtreets in ſad plight; or the multitudes that were baptized promiſcuouſly by John at Jordan and Enon, who all muſt have changes of raiment, or muſt ſtand and travel in wet cloaths?

As Baptiſm is the emblem of regeneration, in which the ſubjects, are according to Dr. Gill wholly paſſive; why ſhould they not in the other, which they are when ſprinkled, but not when dipped?

Why ſhould Antipædobaptiſts in England, lay greater ſtreſs on dipping, than their brethren in Holland; who many of them adminiſter Baptiſm by pouring water on the ſubject?

If the Jewiſh and the Chriſtian churches, are but one and the ſame Church of God, under different adminiſtrations and ordinances, why ſhould not the privileges be equally extended to parents and their children?

How could the bleſſing of Abraham come upon the Gentiles, if their children are not included in the covenant and Church of God, and are deprived of the ſeal?

Why

Why ſhould the original ſeal and token of God's covenant with his people, by which their children were admitted into his church, be applied to them by divine command two thouſand years; and when a more gracious and extenſive diſpenſation took place, the ſeal be refuſed them by men, without any ſcripture warrant, or the leaſt revocation of the privilege?

Why ſhould infants be caſt out of the viſible church, without a poſitive expreſs command; as they were taken in by one?

Why ſhould not God be a God in covenant with the children of Chriſtians, as well as with thoſe of the Patriarchs and Jews?

If children are now excluded the viſible church, are not the privileges of the Chriſtian diſpenſation, leſs than thoſe of the moſaic?

Can it be ſuppoſed, that the believing Jews would have ſo readily embraced the Goſpel, if their children muſt not have entered the church with them, but be looked on and treated as the children of unbaptized Infidels?

Why did the believing Jews diſpute, whether their children ſhould be circumciſed, if they did not eſteem them proper ſubjects of Chriſt's church?

Why ſhould the children of believing parents be treated as unclean Gentiles, ſtanding in no relation to God; when the Apoſtles have pronounced them Holy, and declared that the promiſes not of the temporal covenant, but of the covenant of Grace extend to them?

Why ſhould children be debarred from the ſign and ſeal, when they are acknowledged capable of poſſeſſing the thing ſignified and ſealed, ſpiritual bleſſings?

Why ſhould it be thought that Baptiſm did not ſucceed circumciſion, one being the initiating ordinance into the church of God before Chriſt, and the other appointed

pointed for that end, by, and ſince Chriſt; or why ſhould not Baptiſm be applied to the ſame ſubjects, infants now, as circumciſion was of old?

Why ſhould faith and repentance be made pre-requiſites for Baptiſm, or initiating perſons into God's viſible church, any more under one diſpenſation than another? or why are not the children of chriſtian parents, as proper members of the Church, as the children of Jews and Proſelyted Gentiles?

How could the Apoſtles underſtand their commiſſion any other way, than to baptize and receive children with their parents into the viſible church, unleſs prohibited; as it had been the practice of the Jews for centuries before, reſpecting their Proſelytes?

Why ſhould the order of words be more inſiſted on, in one text of ſcripture than in another, eſpecially in that of the Apoſtle's commiſſion, as all the Jewiſh children were firſt circumciſed, or made diſciples, and then taught.

Why were infants taken into our Saviour's arms and bleſſed by him, and declared members of his kingdom or church in earth and in heaven; if they were not proper ſubjects, and he did not intend they ſhould be treated as favourably under the Goſpel, as during the legal diſpenſation?

Muſt not thoſe that are members of the kingdom of glory, be intereſted in the covenant of grace, why then ſhould children be denied the ſeal of the covenant?

Why ſhould men refuſe to receive thoſe into the viſible church, whom God graciouſly receives into Heaven, and on whom he confers the beſt of bleſſings?

Why ſhould not there be children in the houſholds that were baptized, as well as in moſt others; or why ſhould not they be baptized on the faith of their parents, as well as the children of the Patriarchs and Jews be circumciſed on the faith of theirs?

If

Why ſhould God puniſh children for the ſins of parents, and not bleſs them for their parents faith and holineſs, or why ſhould he be more merciful to the bodies of children and others, for the faith of parents and friends, than to their ſouls?

If Chriſt was baptiſed without faith and repentance, and who was incapable of receiving any moral benefit thereby, why ſhould not children be Baptized; or what greater benefit do adult perſons receive at their Baptiſm, than do children?

Why ſhould it be thought unreaſonable, to require ſcripture precedents of perſons Baptized at adult years who were born of chriſtian parents, when the hiſtory of the new teſt includes 60 years after Chriſt?

What expreſs command or precedent is there for dipping the whole body under water, or for delaying the Baptiſm of children born of chriſtian parents, or for Baptiſing them at adult years?

How came it to paſs, that the chriſtian church univerſally practiſed infant Baptiſm from the days of the Apoſtles, and no body of chriſtians till the eleventh, and no writer of note till the ſixteenth century oppoſed it, if 'twas not the will of Chriſt, and the practiſe of his Apoſtles?

Sir, theſe queſtions are a ſummary of the ſeveral letters you have received from me, on Dr. Gill's late Sermon on the ſubjects and mode of Baptiſm: If they do not make you likeminded with myſelf; I am perſuaded, you will now think, 'tis not without ſome *ſtrong reaſons* I diſſent from you: Though the *whole chriſtian world* (very few individuals excepted) *is with me*; I lay no ſtreſs upon that; yet when we ſeriouſly reflect, is it not ſtrange, that for *ſo many centuries*, Chriſt ſhould ſuffer his miniſters and people univerſally to err, in *two ſo material articles, as the proper ſubjects of his viſible Church*, and *the initiating ordinance into it?* But not to enlarge; what hath paſſed between us, inſtead of diſſolving our friend-

friendſhip, will I truſt, rather knit us the cloſer, and make us more readily, *put on charity, which is the bond of perfectneſs*. Probably your obſervation will be true "*that* "*my Letters if publiſhed, will make the Doctor ſnarl, and* "*preach and print againſt me.*" But, Sir, inform him, that unleſs he writes to the purpoſe, unleſs he *leaves off to quibble*, and *evade*, and *beg the queſtion*, unleſs like a D. D. (without the ſhameful loſs of charity and good manners) he gives *fair*, *ingenuous*, and *ſolid anſwers*, to the ſeveral queſtions propoſed, and arguments advanced; he may write and write again, without any notice taken of him: Beg him alſo, not to produce any more *quotations* and *charitable conceſſions* from the learned, as on his ſide; when he knows their *ſentiments*, *writings*, and *practice*, were directly againſt him; this is *worſe* than ſtiling them *Dunces*; 'tis making them *feloniouſly to ſtab themſelves*. You may alſo aſſure him, ſhould he pour on me all the opprobrious names, which diſtinguiſh his former writings from other mens; I ſhall not be in the leaſt diſappointed, or diſquieted; but be ſtill ready *as a brother*, to *reprove*, *exhort*, *forgive* and *throw the mantle of charity over him*. In the exerciſe of that divine grace, *charity*, and in obedience to all the moral precepts of God and of Chriſt, let us, Sir, *go on unto perfection*; receiving and loving one another, as *Chriſt hath received and loved us*. This is the deſire and reſolution of,

Dear, Sir,

Your's, &c.

FINIS.